
Class No.....

[illegible]

Debates on Indian Affairs.

HOUSE OF LORDS

SESSION 1921

11 AND 12 GEORGE V.

[*From 15th February to 10th November, 1921.*]

COMPRISING EXTRACTS FROM

THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(*OFFICIAL REPORT*)

OF ALL QUESTIONS, PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES RELATING
TO INDIAN AFFAIRS.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THE COMPTROLLER OF HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE

BY

HARRISON AND SONS, LTD.,

ST. MARTIN'S LANE, W.C.,

PRINTERS IN ORDINARY TO HIS MAJESTY.

1922.

HIS MAJESTY'S GOVERNMENT.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF STATE.

THE CABINET.

Prime Minister—Rt. Hon. DAVID LLOYD GEORGE, O.M., M.P.
Lord Privy Seal—Rt. Hon. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, M.P.
Lord President of the Council—Rt. Hon. A. J. BALFOUR, O.M., F.R.S., M.P.
Chancellor of the Exchequer—Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT S. HORNE, G.B.E., K.C., M.P.
Lord Chancellor—Rt. Hon. Viscount BIRKENHEAD.
Secretaries of State—
 Home Department—Rt. Hon. EDWARD SHORTT, K.C., M.P.
 Foreign Affairs—Most Hon. The Marquess CURZON OF KEDLESTON, K.G., G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E.
 Colonial Office—Rt. Hon. WINSTON S. CHURCHILL, M.P.
 War Office—Rt. Hon. Sir LAMING WORTHINGTON-EVANS, Bart., M.P.
 India Office—Rt. Hon. E. S. MONTAGU, M.P.
First Lord of the Admiralty—Rt. Hon. Lord LEE OF FAREHAM, G.B.E., K.C.B.
Chief Secretary for Ireland—Rt. Hon. Lieut.-Colonel Sir HAMAR GREENWOOD, Bart., K.C., M.P.
President of the Board of Education—Rt. Hon. H. A. L. FISHER, M.P.
Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries—Rt. Hon. Sir ARTHUR S. T. GRIFFITH-BOSCAWEN, M.P.
Minister of Health—Rt. Hon. Sir ALFRED MOND, Bart., M.P.
President of the Board of Trade—Rt. Hon. STANLEY BALDWIN, M.P.
Secretary for Scotland—Rt. Hon. ROBERT MUNRO, K.C., M.P.
Minister of Labour—Rt. Hon. T. J. MACNAMARA, LL.D., M.P.
Attorney-General—Rt. Hon. Sir GORDON HEWART, K.C., M.P.

OTHER MINISTERS.

Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster—Rt. Hon. Viscount PEEL, G.B.E.
First Commissioner of Works—Rt. Hon. The Earl of CRAWFORD.
Parliamentary Under-Secretaries of State for Foreign Affairs—CECIL B. HARMSWORTH, Esq., M.P.,
 and Sir PHILIP LLOYD-GREAME, K.B.E., M.C., M.P.
Solicitor-General—Sir ERNEST M. POLLOCK, K.B.E., K.C., M.P.
Postmaster-General—Rt. Hon. F. G. KELLAWAY, M.P.
Pensions Minister—Rt. Hon. J. IAN MACPHERSON, K.C., M.P.
Paymaster-General—Rt. Hon. Sir JOHN TUDOR WALTERS, M.P.
Minister of Transport—Rt. Hon. Viscount PEEL, G.B.E. (*unpaid*).
Under-Secretary of State, Colonial Office—Hon. E. F. L. WOOD, M.P.
Under-Secretary of State, Home Department—Sir JOHN L. BAIRD, C.M.G., D.S.O., M.P.
Under-Secretary of State, War Office—Lt.-Col. Sir R. A. SANDERS, Bart., M.P.
Secretary of State for Air and President of the Air Council—Capt. the Rt. Hon. F. E. GUEST, C.B.E.,
 D.S.O., M.P.
Under-Secretary of State for Air—Rt. Hon. Lord GORELL, C.B.E., M.C.
Under-Secretary of State, India Office—Rt. Hon. The Earl of LYTTON.
Civil Lord of the Admiralty—B. M. EYRES-MONSELL, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary and Financial Secretary of the Admiralty—L. C. M. S. AMERY, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary of the Board of Education—Rt. Hon. J. HERBERT LEWIS, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary of the Board of Trade—Sir WILLIAM MITCHELL-THOMSON, K.B.E., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary of the Ministry of Health—Rt. Hon. The Earl of ONSLOW, O.B.E.
Joint Parliamentary Secretaries to the Treasury—Rt. Hon. C. A. MCCURDY, K.C., M.P., and Lt.-Col.
 L. WILSON, C.M.G., D.S.O., M.P.
Financial Secretary to the Treasury—Lt.-Commander E. HILTON YOUNG, D.S.O., D.S.C., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary of the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries—Rt. Hon. The Earl of ANCASTER.
Secretary for Mines—Rt. Hon. W. C. BRIDGEMAN, M.P.
Parliamentary and Financial Secretary to the War Office—The Hon. G. F. STANLEY, C.M.G., M.P.
Assistant Postmaster-General—Rt. Hon. HERBERT PIKE PEASE, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Pensions—Major G. C. TRYON, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Transport—ARTHUR NEAL, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Labour—Sir MONTAGUE BARLOW, K.B.E., M.P.

Lords Commissioners of the Treasury—
 { Lt.-Col. Sir JOHN GILMOUR, Bart., D.S.O., M.P.
 { JAMES PARKER, Esq., C.H., M.P.
 { Rev. J. TOWYN JONES, M.P. (*unpaid*).
 { Sir WILLIAM SUTHERLAND, K.C.B., M.P.
 Department of Overseas Trade (Development and Intelligence)—Secretary, Sir PHILIP LLOYD-
 GREAME, K.B.E., M.C., M.P.
 Lord Chamberlain—Rt. Hon. Viscount SANDHURST, G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E., G.C.V.O.
 Lord Steward of the Household—Rt. Hon. Viscount FARQUHAR, G.C.V.O.
 Master of the Horse—Rt. Hon. The Earl of CHESTERFIELD, K.G., G.C.V.O.
 Captain of the Yeomen of the Guard—Rt. Hon. Lord HYLTON.
 Captain of the Gentlemen-at-Arms—Rt. Hon. Lord COLEBROOKE, C.V.O.
 Lords-in-Waiting—
 { Rt. Hon. Lord STANMORE.
 { Rt. Hon. Lord SOMERLEYTON.
 { Rt. Hon. The Earl of CLARENDON.
 { Rt. Hon. The Earl of LUCAN, K.B.E., C.B.
 { Rt. Hon. Viscount VALENTIA, C.B., M.V.O.
 { Rt. Hon. The Earl of BRADFORD.
 Treasurer of the Household—Col. G. A. GIBBS, M.P.
 Comptroller of the Household—Major HARRY BARNSTON, M.P.
 Vice-Chamberlain—Lieut.-Commander W. DUDLEY WARD, M.P.

SCOTLAND.

Secretary for Scotland and Keeper of the Great Seal—Rt. Hon. ROBERT MUNRO, K.C., M.P.
 Lord Advocate—Rt. Hon. T. B. MORISON, K.C., M.P.
 Solicitor-General—C. D. MURRAY, Esq., K.C., C.M.G., M.P.
 Parliamentary Under-Secretary for Health—J. W. PRATT, Esq., M.P.

IRELAND.

Lord-Lieutenant—Rt. Hon. Viscount FITZALAN OF DERWENT, G.C.V.O., D.S.O.
 Chief Secretary and Keeper of Privy Seal—Rt. Hon. Lt.-Col. Sir HAMAR GREENWOOD, Bart., K.C.,
 M.P.
 Lord Chancellor—Rt. Hon. Sir JOHN ROSS, Bart.
 Attorney-General—Rt. Hon. THOMAS W. BROWN, K.C., M.P.
 Solicitor-General—*Vacant*.
 Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction (Ireland)—Rt. Hon.
 HUGH T. BARRIE, M.P.

INDIA DEBATES.

SESSION 1921.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 15th February, 1921.

THE KING'S SPEECH.

THE KING being seated on the Throne, and the Commons being at the Bar with their Speaker, His Majesty was pleased to make a most gracious Speech to both Houses of Parliament, and then retired.

His Majesty's Speech was as follows—

“ My Lords and Members of the House of Commons,

“ My relations with Foreign Powers continue to be of a friendly nature. Conferences will be held at an early date in London, which will be attended by Our Allies in the late war and also by representatives of Germany and Turkey. I earnestly trust that by this means further progress will be made in giving effect to the Treaties of Peace, in re-establishing concord in Europe and in restoring tranquillity in the Near East. It is My hope that the negotiations for a trade agreement with Russia will also be brought to a successful conclusion.

“ The Duke of Connaught has inaugurated the new Councils in India, and I pray that the assumption by My subjects in India of new political responsibilities may secure progress in administration and an early appeasement of political strife.

“ The policy of My Government in regard to Egypt, following upon the investigations of the Special Mission appointed in 1919, will be laid before you.

“ I am glad to say that arrangements have been made to renew that personal consultation between My Ministers here and their colleagues overseas, which produced such good results during the last two years of the war and during the Peace settlement. I hope that the

Prime Ministers of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, the Union of South Africa and Newfoundland, as well as representatives of India, will be able to visit this country during the coming summer. I am confident that the discussions to take place during their visits will be of the utmost value in bringing about co-ordination both in the external and internal policy of the Empire.

“ Members of the House of Commons,

“ The estimates for the Services in the coming year will be laid before you in due course, and these estimates will reflect the determination of the Government to reduce expenditure to the lowest level consistent with the well-being of the Empire. The war has left upon the nation liabilities which can only be met by heavy taxation, but it is imperative in the interest of an early revival of trade and industry that this burden should be reduced to the utmost.

“ My Lords and Members of the House of Commons,

“ The situation in Ireland still causes Me distress. A misguided section of the Irish people persist in resorting to methods of criminal violence with the object of establishing an independent Republic. Neither Irish unity nor Irish self-government can be attained by this means. The arrangements for bringing into force the Government of Ireland Act are now well advanced, and I earnestly trust that in the near future the majority of the people will show their determination to repudiate violence and to work an Act which confers upon them the responsibilities of self-government and provides the machinery whereby they can attain to Irish unity by constitutional means.

“ In view of the onerous programme of legislation which was set before you during last year, it is the intention of My Ministers to lighten as far as possible

the business of the coming Session. The most pressing problem which confronts you is that of unemployment, consequent upon a world-wide restriction of trade, and this may be alleviated, but cannot be cured, by legislative means. This problem, with its acute and distressing consequences for hundreds of thousands of our fellow-citizens, is receiving the constant and anxious attention of My Ministers with the object both of reviving trade and prosperity and in the meantime of assisting those who are unfortunately unemployed. You will be invited to pass a Bill extending the provision which is made for the unemployed under the Unemployment Insurance Act. A measure will also be introduced into the House of Commons to deal with the safeguarding of essential key industries of the country and with certain aspects of unfair and abnormal industrial competition. I earnestly trust that these efforts will be seconded by loyal and frank co-operation between employers and employed, for it is through the co-operation of capital and labour in a spirit of mutual trust and confidence that an early solution of this grave problem is to be found.

"It is proposed that the forthcoming removal of control over the home price and export quantities of coal shall be followed at the earliest possible moment by the complete restoration of the industry to its normal condition of freedom.

"In accordance with the intention expressed in the Ministry of Transport Act, a Bill will be submitted to you for the reorganisation of the railways of Great Britain.

"Bills will be laid before you dealing with the completion of land purchase in Ireland, and also for facilitating Church union in Scotland.

"A Bill will also be presented dealing with the sale of alcoholic liquor in the light of the experience gained during the war.

"My Ministers further trust that the work of the Committee now examining the question of the Reform of the Second Chamber will be finished in time to permit of proposals being submitted to Parliament during the course of the present Session.

"And I pray the blessing of Almighty God rest upon your deliberations."

The King's Speech.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 22nd February, 1921.

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (THE EARL OF LYTON) rose to move—

"That it is desirable that a Committee of eleven Lords be appointed to join with a Committee of eleven Members to be appointed by the House of Commons as a Standing Joint Committee on Indian affairs."

The noble Earl said: My Lords, as the Committee referred to in the Motion which stands in my name is a new departure in our Parliamentary procedure I ought to explain very shortly the origin of the proposal. The matter was first referred to in the Report on Indian Constitutional Reforms generally known as the Montagu-Chelmsford Report. On page 236 of that Report a Select Committee of the House of Commons is proposed as the only means of ensuring in Parliament a better-informed and more sustained interest in India. The Report continues:—

"Such a Select Committee would, like other Select Committees, exercise its powers by informing itself from time to time upon Indian questions, and by reporting to the House before the annual debate on the Indian estimates. Like other Select Committees, it would have no administrative functions. The Secretary of State would appear before it to answer questions about those aspects of Indian administration in which he, and therefore Parliament, continued to exercise the right to interfere. Thus, by means of interrogations and requisitions for Papers, the members of the Committee would keep themselves informed upon Indian questions."

The matter was then considered by the Joint Select Committee on the Government of India Bill, and they recommended that it should be a Joint Committee of both Houses of Parliament and not a Committee of the House of Commons. That Committee stated:—

"The change which this Bill will make in the political structure and life of India is very important. It marks a great step in the path of self-government, and it is a proof of the confidence reposed by His Majesty's Government in the loyalty, wisdom and capacity of our Indian fellow-subjects. At the same time it points to the desirability of keeping Parliament in closer touch with Indian affairs than has recently been possible. The Committee accordingly propose that a Standing Joint Committee should be appointed by both Houses of Parliament for that purpose. It should have no statutory functions, but a purely advisory and consultative status;

and among its tasks is one of high importance, the consideration of amendments to the Rules made under the Bill."

It is to carry out the recommendations of the Committee that I make the Motion standing in any name.

Moved to resolve, "That it is desirable that a Committee of eleven Lords be appointed to join with a Committee of eleven Members to be appointed by the House of Commons as a Standing Joint Committee on Indian affairs."—(*The Earl of Lytton*.)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 24th February, 1921.

SLAUGHTER OF COWS IN INDIA.

LORD TENTERDEN rose to ask His Majesty's Government for information as to the number of cows slaughtered annually in India, and to invite the attention of the House to the effect of this upon the agricultural development, and the present high rate of infantile mortality in India.

The noble Lord said: My Lords, the first part of the Question relates to the number of cows slaughtered in India. This is of importance in a country which depends so much on agriculture, and where 75 per cent. of the population is engaged in agricultural pursuits. It is very important that cows should be preserved as far as possible, in order that there should be a sufficient number of bullocks to carry on the stock. I am informed that that is not the case at the present moment. On the contrary, there has been a gradual and continuous depletion of the number of bullocks, through the indiscriminate slaughter of cows. This is a question which has been brought forward by the representatives of the great Indian Empire on more than one occasion.

I wish to ask His Majesty's Government whether they can give me reliable statistics as to the number of cows slaughtered annually in India, so that I may arrive at a conclusion as to whether my statements are in every sense of the word accurate, as I maintain they are. Many of your Lordships who have, like myself, travelled in India—I have spent two and a half years there—and are therefore conversant with the conditions in India,

know from personal observation that those conditions place a very high premium on the value of the ox. The depletion of oxen means the curtailment of agricultural pursuits. Oxen provide the only means of transport you have there, apart from the railways, of which there are not very many for so vast a country, and this matter is of very serious moment to the people of the Indian Empire, as I think I shall be able to prove. Indeed, for some years it has formed the subject of correspondence between gentlemen representative of India and various Under-Secretaries of State for India, and a long Petition, signed by millions of Indian subjects, has been presented to successive monarchs without, so far, achieving any success. One individual who, in particular, has been very zealous in this matter is the Secretary of the All India Cattle Protecting and Breeding Association, Mr. Jassawalla. He has, in conjunction with Hindu and Mahomedan gentlemen, presented a succession of Petitions, which have not yet met with favour from His Majesty's Government.

After many attempts these gentlemen received a reply from the Secretary of State for India in 1912, to the effect that the statistics of livestock in British India were not sufficiently accurate for inclusion in abstract, that receipts of markets and slaughter houses were not shown separately in the Reports, and that no figures were available as to the number of cattle used annually in India, either for food or for the purpose of export of meat. In 1918 Sir Gangadhar Chitnavis, a member of the Indian Council, in the interests of agriculture, drew attention to this question of the slaughter of cows, and Sir Claude Hill replied on behalf of the Government, saying that the next census would be taken in 1920, and that in the meantime the Government would not be able to give the exact number of the cattle that had been slaughtered in India. It seems to me quite possible that the Government will be able now, in 1921, to afford me some information on what I consider an important subject, not only in the Imperial interest but also in its bearing upon the interest of our own country.

I now pass to the next part of my Question, in which I invite your Lordships to consider the effect of the indiscriminate slaughter of cows upon agricultural development and upon infantile mortality. The bullocks now in India fulfil every con-

ceivable purpose that any animal born into this world can fulfil. They thresh the corn; they extract the sugar; they extract the oil; and they are the only means of transport from the farms and the fields. They are the Alpha and Omega, to some extent, of the industry of India. This is a matter that cannot be lightly passed over. It is one which, I submit, deserves at least the serious consideration of His Majesty's Government. No greater favour can be conferred upon the Indian people than that it should be so considered. The slaughtering of prime cows jeopardises every industry, and adds not only to the cost of living of the inhabitants of India, but creates also an additional, and I suggest unnecessary, shortage of food in this country. The reason for the slaughtering of cows, as given by the inhabitants of India, is that they cannot afford to slaughter the oxen, which are so valuable. Another reason is that they have an insufficiency of grazing ground.

In this respect it is important to note that the All India Cattle Association, a thoroughly representative body, has been working hard for years—it is still a very strong Association and has a following of millions of people—and has suggested that for every one hundred acres of arable land there should be granted five acres of free grazing land. To some extent that would get over the difficulty of grazing. But the difficulty has been for years aggravated by the Government seizing what was grazing ground and turning it into forest ground. They may have had more timber in consequence, but they have lost something more valuable in the shape of oxen. The latest figures of Indian agricultural statistics show 229,000,000 acres of cultivated land. Therefore, if you grant five acres of free grazing land for every 100 acres, that would amount to only 11,000,000 acres in all, which is not much as compared with 229,000,000 acres. Out of 158,000,000 acres of further land returned as useful land, 112,000,000 were returned as cultivable waste, and 46,000,000 as fallow and not under cultivation. It seems to me that that speaks volumes for my contention that the shortage of oxen interferes with agricultural pursuits, because all this fallow land has been abandoned by reason of the lack of sufficient oxen. In the meantime there is possible loss of revenue to India and a shortage of food which is seriously felt throughout the United Kingdom and the Empire.

Lord Tenterden

I maintain that this additional cultivable land, by means of irrigation, which does such wonderful things in India, could be turned to good account, and India could produce half as much again as she is producing at the present moment. That is not a matter to be put lightly aside. Apart from the satisfaction that you would give to the Indian population by doing what you can to protect the cows and thereby increase the number of oxen, you would derive additional revenue through the improved industrial capacity of the people. Statistics exist concerning the land cultivated and irrigated which bear out what I have said. There are in India 47,966,000 acres which are irrigated, and an area of 18,931,000 acres are irrigated by waters drawn from wells and rivers by means of oxen, so that here again the ox comes in as an important adjunct to cultivation. One cannot get away from the fact that methods which have been in existence almost since the world began are still adopted in India, where the population is not sufficiently well off to afford steam or motor ploughs, and there are no horses.

It has been asserted—and rightly—that this forms the subject of religious disaffection in India. When the Mahomedans tried to convert the Parsees many of them fled to India and were received with open arms by the Hindus upon embracing a part of their faith—a most sensible part, the protection of the cow. It has been said that there were Mahomedans who were prepared to eat cow's flesh and to fight for liberty to do so, and that riots took place. Whether or not that was so, I am informed on the best authority that such a difference of religious opinion, if such existed at one time, no longer exists, and that there is a united feeling on the part of Mahomedans, Hindus, Parsees, and in fact the whole population of India, to protect cows in order that they may continue to have these oxen, which are so essential to the continued existence of industrial pursuits in India. Meetings have been held in Calcutta and in many other parts of India. I have seen newspaper reports of those meetings, which show that Mahomedans and Hindus jointly had but one object in view, and that was to try to protect their cattle. It seems to me that this is a subject which, if dealt with sympathetically by His Majesty's Government, would meet with a very ready response from the inhabitants of India.

Another point is the supply of milk, which is totally inadequate to meet the demand. I dare say that I shall be told—though I need not be told, because I know it quite well—that buffalo's milk and goat's milk are available. While that is true we must bear in mind the fact that no one would keep buffaloes who could keep cows, because oxen are so much more valuable in helping to cultivate the land. You cannot make a buffalo work in the fields in the same way as an ox. It is an unwieldy animal, impossible to use for transport purposes. I have been in all parts of India, and I have never yet seen buffaloes used for such purposes. In my opinion it is essential to do everything possible to protect cows from being slaughtered. I pass by the question as to whether or not Mahomedans, Hindus and Parsees are agreed with regard to the slaughter of cows. I would, however, ask your Lordships to consider this point. We are a protecting Power exercising sway over British India, and we ought not to add to the business troubles of the natives by feeding the British garrison upon these cows. It is reported that 150,000 cows are slaughtered annually for the purpose of feeding the British garrison. In that way we are depleting the number of cows in India, and thus depriving Indians of their livelihood. There seems to me to be no real reason why this should be done.

I have gone into this question, and I have a letter from a very big firm—the well-known firm of Weddel & Co., of 17, St. Helen's Place, who say—

“If the Government will entertain the idea of supplying frozen meat to the British troops in India, we would be prepared to negotiate a contract with them on the basis of our providing the meat and the freight, and also undertaking to erect the necessary cold storage at two Indian ports.”

That would be a step, if adopted, towards carrying out the proposals that I am putting forward. Moreover, I would point out that the Indian revenue is very strong, and can bear any additional cost that this might cast upon it. Furthermore, I am informed that the great Maharajahs and Princes of India are so interested in their own country, most of them being very large landowners, that they would be prepared to subsidise any scheme of this kind in order to ensure that there should not be a loss to the Indian Government. For my own part I do not see that there ought to be a loss

to the Government, because if you import Australian meat into India you create a greater trade between India and Australia, and, therefore, increase the revenue of India. If we did not import from Australia or New Zealand we could do so from the Argentine, where plenty of meat is available. There seems to me to be a valid case for adopting such a plan.

The further question of infantile mortality is one which we, as Christians, cannot very well ignore. Is it nothing that infant mortality in India is so very far in excess of that of other countries? I have the figures here. Compare Bombay, for instance, with towns in other parts of the world. In Sydney, Australia, the infant mortality is 59 per thousand; in Adelaide, 60 per thousand; in Copenhagen, 92 per thousand; in New York, 102 per thousand; in London, 110 per thousand; in Paris, 125 per thousand. In Bombay, however, it is no less than 329 per thousand, which is nearly three times the Paris figure. What is the reason for this? The reason is that they cannot get the milk. How many children would be brought up in this country if there was no milk? The whole of them would die, and, for the same reason, those children are dying in India. His Majesty's Government, I admit, are very sorely pressed at the present moment with Conferences and other important matters, and if they cannot deal with the question now I hope they will be able to give me some sort of promise that they will do so later and thereby confer what I believe will be a lasting blessing on India, which will not be forgotten by the inhabitants.

LORD SYDENHAM: The noble Lord who has just spoken does not, perhaps, quite realise that there must be at least 110,000,000 people in India who eat beef whenever they can get it. That figure includes about 70,000 Mahomedans. The reason they eat beef is that it is very much cheaper than either mutton or goat's flesh in India, and any restriction on the killing of cattle would, I assure him, give rise to the very greatest resentment amongst a large number of very poor people. As a rule it is only the older cows which are killed when they are no longer able to give any milk, and it is only the beef of those old cows that the poor classes are able to get.

As the noble Lord said, milk in India is very largely produced by the buffalo, whose milk is richer than the milk of the

cow, at any rate of the Indian cow, and the buffalo produces about three times as much milk as the cow. But the real economic difficulty in India—I have seen it myself—is that the poor people try to keep far more cows than they can properly feed, with the result that the cow in India is often a most miserable-looking animal. The noble Lord also said that there had been some great re-afforestation in India. I cannot think that that is the case. When I was in Bombay I de-forested a very large area of land that had been previously under forest regulations and the people were very grateful for this step, as it gave them the opportunity of using it for grazing. I am in some doubt as to whether any great amount of re-afforestation is going on in India at the present time, and perhaps the noble Earl will be able to say.

On the question of infantile mortality, the high death rate among infants in India is a very terrible thing. When I was in India we looked into all the causes of that mortality and I can assure the noble Lord that shortage of milk was not one of them. There are several causes, one of the most important being the marriage of immature boys and girls. Then, as to the effect of cow killing, I can assure the noble Lord that there is nothing in it, though it is most natural and proper that the Hindus should use it in connection with their religious principles, because they wish to preserve the cow at all costs. If cow killing was not carried out it would lead to immense suffering amongst these poor animals, because they would wander about the country until they died of starvation. May I suggest to the noble Lord that we must leave this kind of question to be dealt with and discussed in the Indian Councils and not attempt to deal with it ourselves? Questions are involved which it is much better to leave alone.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (THE EARL OF LYTTON): My Lords, with regard to the information asked for by the noble Lord in his Question, I regret to tell him that we have no information of any value with regard to the number of cows slaughtered annually in India, and it would be impossible to provide him with the statistics for which he asks except by setting up an *ad hoc* Inquiry in each Province in India.

With reference to the question of infant mortality, I agree with what Lord Sydenham.

ham has just said and I would point out to the noble Lord, Lord Tenterden, that whatever may be the causes of the high rate of infant mortality in India, I think he is not justified in attributing that high rate to one cause only—that dealt with in his Question. I have examined the statistics for the ten years from 1908 to 1919, and they do not suggest that infant mortality has increased during that time. The figures are pretty stationary throughout the period, except in 1918, when there was a sharp rise undoubtedly attributable to the influenza epidemic.

So much for the questions of fact, but on the question of policy which the noble Lord has discussed I must decline to enter into a discussion at all for the simple reason that neither His Majesty's Government nor this House are any longer responsible for the matter dealt with in the noble Lord's speech. The noble Lord several times expressed the wish that His Majesty's Government would deal sympathetically with the question, but I would point out to him that His Majesty's Government is no longer responsible. A very important constitutional matter is here involved, and, as I think this is the first occasion upon which any Question has been addressed to the Government upon matters which have now been transferred to the jurisdiction of Ministers in India, it is desirable that the position should be made perfectly clear. There are three Departments of Government involved in the noble Lord's question, the agricultural, the veterinary, and the municipal. All these are transferred subjects now under the jurisdiction of Indian Ministers.

It is quite true that the Secretary of State has a general power of superintendence and direction over Indian affairs conferred upon him by the Government of India Act, but it has been the subject of a Resolution by the Secretary of State in Council that the discretion which is vested in him shall not be exercised in future in regard to transferred subjects, except for the purposes of safeguarding the administration of Central subjects, of deciding questions arising between two Provinces in cases where the Provinces concerned fail to arrive at agreement, of safeguarding Imperial interests, and of determining the position of the Government of India in respect of questions arising between India and other parts of the Empire. Therefore only in matters where

Central Indian or Imperial interests are involved is the general power of supervision now exercised by the Secretary of State over transferred subjects.

That being so, those who, like the noble Lord, take an interest in this question should direct themselves to those who are now responsible—namely, the Ministers presiding over these subjects, and the Legislative Councils in each of the Provinces to which they are responsible, and not His Majesty's Government, or either House of Parliament in this country, who no longer have the responsibility for the matters concerned.

THE MARQUESS OF CREWE: My Lords, I have no desire to say anything on the subject matter of the noble Lord's Question, which has been dealt with to some extent in the observations of my noble friend on the cross benches. I rise merely to say a word with regard to the very important, and I think very necessary, caution which has been delivered by the noble Earl opposite. It was prominent in the minds of some of us, certainly in my own mind, during the progress of the Government of India Act, under which certain subjects were handed over to the discretion of the Provincial Governments in India, with full powers to them to make their own mistakes as well as carry out their own improvements, that there was a risk that Parliament might interfere by Question or Motion, either in this House or in another place, and so tend to neutralise the proper effect of the new legislation. I am glad, therefore, that the noble Earl has given us this warning, and I have no doubt that if it is necessary it will be repeated elsewhere. It is most important that we should not attempt to carry on two different systems of government simultaneously; that is to say, to give with one hand powers to the Provincial Governments in India, and at the same time to be perpetually asking questions as to the method by which those powers have been exercised.

LORD AMPHILL: My Lords, I desire to dissociate myself entirely and immediately from the remarks of the noble Marquess. We know now where we are. It is evident that the intention of the Government is to burke inquiry and discussion of Indian affairs in Parliament. We saw that by what happened in another place last night, and we have had it stated in the most explicit terms this afternoon.

Interference with the actions of the new Legislative Governments in India is one thing, but it is quite another thing to inquire as to facts; and nothing can derogate from the right of members of the British Parliament to ask for information as to the acts of British officials and the British Government in India, so long as India remains a part of the British Empire and His Majesty the King is Emperor of India. I shall protest on every possible occasion at attempts to stifle inquiry in Parliament, or elsewhere, about facts in India. Parliament has every right to know what is going on and it is eminently desirable that Parliament and the public should be fully informed of what is being done in India, why it is being done, and the whole tendency of events there. The Question of the noble Lord, although in my opinion ill-advised, was a perfectly legitimate Question and in no sense an interference with the duties of the newly-appointed Governments.

THE INDIAN EXCHANGE.

LORD SYDENHAM had a Question on the Paper to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether the adoption by the Secretary of State of the policy suggested by the Currency Committee has led to the loss by exchange of 35 crores (about £25 millions sterling) to the Indian Exchequer, and has also disorganised the export and import trade; and whether the Indian exchange, which stood at about 2s. 4d. when this policy for raising it was applied, has now fallen to less than 1s. 4d.

The noble Lord said: My Lords, I regret that owing to my miscalculating the length of the speech of my noble friend Lord Parmoor on his Bill I was not here when my Question was reached; and I ask your Lordships to allow me to put it now.

THE MARQUESS OF CREWE: My Lords, before the Lord Chancellor says anything on this point, I should like to remark, as this is a matter of the order of the House, that if it is the desire of your Lordships that my noble friend should be allowed to put his Question, I shall offer no opposition. At the same time, I feel well assured that no one appreciates more than my noble friend the necessity of carrying on our business here in a due and orderly manner. The attendance in your Lordships' House is apt to be sparse, unless some exciting topic, such as reprisals in

Ireland, happens to be the subject of discussion, and there is all the more danger therefore that our proceedings might become haphazard and slipshod unless we adhere strongly to the regular Rules of Order. I remember in the course of my experience a great number of cases of noble Lords miscalculating, as Lord Sydenham has done, the length of the preceding business immediately before their own Motions. They were caught napping, as Lord Sydenham has been caught, and lost their opportunity. In some cases they were even obliged to postpone for a considerable period the Second Reading of an important Bill. Although I am not going to oppose the granting of leave to the noble Lord on this occasion, I feel bound to utter a word of caution, and to say that on the next occasion such an event occurs I shall probably be found opposing to the best of my ability the granting of such leave.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (LORD BIRKENHEAD): My Lords, I agree, as any one must, with the sound doctrines laid down by the noble Marquess. At the same time, if ever there was a case which justified an indulgence it must be on an afternoon when there is so little business to be transacted, and when we can so conveniently deal with the Questions raised by the noble Lord. The noble Lord is so invariably considerate to others that I hope your Lordships will give him leave to ask his Question.

LORD SYDENHAM: I thank your Lordships for your indulgence, and beg to put the Question which stands in my name.

THE EARL OF LYTTON: My Lords, the loss on exchange resulting from the revaluation of the gold and sterling securities in the Paper Currency Reserve and from the sale of reverse drafts at rates in excess of 1s. 4d. is about the figure stated in the noble Lord's question. In pursuance of the policy adopted last February the Government of India sold reverse drafts on London to the extent of £50,000,000 up to the end of September, with a view to the support of exchange. In spite of these sales, exchange has now fallen from about 2s. 4d., where it stood in January, 1920, to about 1s. 4d. Though the high exchange that prevailed in the latter part of 1919, and in the earlier months of 1920, must have acted as a stimulus to imports, it

would not be correct to regard the adoption of the recommendations of the majority of the Indian Currency Committee as the main cause of the present dislocation of Indian trade. This is, in part, due to world causes such as the reduction of the purchasing power of foreign countries, in some cases as a consequence of the depreciation of their currencies; and in part it is due to local conditions which have led to a large excess of imports into India over exports.

This represents to some extent the reaction from the curtailment of imports into India during the war years. For instance, during the year 1920 imports of goods and treasure on private account into India exceeded the exports by 43 crores, whereas in 1919 there was an excess of exports amounting to 125 crores. In the five financial years preceding the war, the average excess of Indian exports over imports amounted to 42 crores. Having regard to the present trade position as exhibited in the above figures and taking into account the extent of the Secretary of State's sterling resources in relation to his commitments, it is not considered that the resumption of the sale of drafts on London would be justifiable at the present time.

The position of the Indian exchange is, of course, a matter of deep concern to the Secretary of State and the Government of India, who suffer grave embarrassment from the heavy fall in exchange that has characterised recent months and from the uncertainty of the future. On the other hand it must be remembered that other exchanges, *e.g.*, sterling, franc, and the other Continental currencies, are all unstable at present. The causes are world-wide and are generally recognised as being beyond the control of individual Governments. In the case of India the revival of the export trade turns largely on favourable monsoon conditions, but much depends also on the recovery of the purchasing power of her old customers. As the world re-settles itself and trade generally is re-established, it may be hoped that conditions will enable stability of exchange to be achieved at the ratio adopted as their objective by the Government of India last year. In conclusion, I would assure my noble friend that this whole matter is receiving the closest and most careful attention of the Secretary of State for India with the view to considering whether or not any further action on his part is required.

The Marquess of Crewe.

LORD AMPHILL: Before the subject is dropped, I think it well that the House should know how it is viewed by our Indian merchants. A very large meeting of East India export merchants was held at the London Chamber of Commerce on February 7, at which a resolution was passed and sent to the Secretary of State. In explaining that resolution they wrote as follows. Perhaps I may be permitted to read to the House a couple of paragraphs, because they are very much to the point—

“Briefly stated the circumstances are as follows:—On the ground that Government led them to believe that the exchange value of the rupee would be 2s. various trade and other associations in India have urged their members that payment of drafts against shipments should be refused unless drawn at that rate. The dealers, with few exceptions, have followed the advice given them, with the result that the bonded warehouses at the principal ports are filled to overflowing with rejected goods. Eastern exchange banks through whom drafts are generally drawn and the trade financed, hampered by the concerted action of the dealers, are pressing us for refund of the advances made in this country against shipment, and intimate that they are not desirous of further business under existing conditions.

“Concurrently, manufacturers are urging us to accept and pay for goods here, now ready for shipment. The shipping trade is paralysed and we merchants engaged in it are exposed to heavy and unwarranted losses, against which the law affords little protection, for one cannot indict a whole community, and the process of the law in India is slow.”

That gives in a few words the pith of a very serious situation.

LORD SYDENHAM: I beg to thank the noble Earl for his reply to my Question and for his assurance that the India Office will do everything to put an end to this deadlock. Might I point the moral in two or three words? The Labour Party has been consistently pressing for the stabilisation of exchanges by legislation. Here we have a well-intentioned attempt to stabilise an exchange by artificial means and it introduced disaster.

THE ARMY IN INDIA.

LORD SYDENHAM rose to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether the recommendations in Sections 4 and 5, Part V, of the Report of the Army in India Committee, which deal with the necessary improvement in the conditions of Indian officers and the rank and file of the Army, have been approved; and if so, what steps have been taken to carry them into effect.

The noble Lord said: My Lords, the Report of the Army in India Committee contains some portions which are perhaps controversial, and much has, I believe, been read into those parts of the Report which was not meant by its authors. Already there has been a resolution carried in one of the Councils of India at Delhi to the effect that the War Office is to have nothing whatever to do with the military forces in India, and that if any consultations are necessary they should take the form of conferences, at which Indians, meaning I suppose, political Indians, shall be fully represented. I can well understand that the Government may wish to defer any decisions on those parts of the Report.

Then there are the recommendations dealing with an improvement in the conditions of the native officers and the rank and file of the Indian army. Those recommendations stand on a quite different footing. Some improvements have already been made in the pay and pensions of the British officers in the Indian Army; but so far nothing has been done for the native officers and the rank and file of that most important force. Some of these reforms, I believe, are already overdue, and I cannot see any reason why they should not have been carried out before the present time. The Committee say, and with perfect truth—

“Whatever form the future Government of India may take . . . the Army cannot fail to be a vital attribute in the hands of the dominant authority.”

Then, in another place, arguing for an increase in pay, the Committee point out that—

“the Indian Army expects a substantial increase, and it would be impolitic to disappoint this expectation especially at a time like this when political agitators aim at undermining the Army's loyalty.”

No one can possibly say what form the Government of India will take, or whether there will be any Government in India within a few years' time from the present; but what is certain, and all that is certain, is that authority is at a very low ebb over large areas of the great sub-continent of India. The only policy that I can discern seems to be to do nothing and to wait until something turns up. I believe that before long something will turn up, and that it will be a great surprise to the British people, who have been kept in the dark, and that it will be a very unpleasant

surprise. Since the Committee reported, agitation has been growing at a great pace and it has greatly increased in its violence and scope. It is more than ever necessary that we should have a contented native Army in India.

I think that all your Lordships who have looked into the Report will have come to the conclusion that the recommendations of the Committee are really very moderate ones. I cannot attempt to give them in detail; but, just to give the House an idea, I will give their proposals as regards the rank and file. The pay of a sowar, which is now 15 rupees, including a war bonus of 4 rupees, is to be raised to 20 rupees, including 2 rupees deferred, to be given on discharge on or after four years' service. The pay of a sepoy is now 15 rupees including the war bonus of 4 rupees. This is to be raised to 18 rupees, including 2 rupees deferred, as in the case of the sowar. There are also to be, I am very glad to see, progressive good conduct scales of pay, and there will be other additions to be won by the attainment of special qualifications. Thus the actual pay to be received by a sowar will be increased by 3 rupees and that of the sepoy by 1 rupee. Surely, that is not much of an increase of pay to these very gallant men.

There is one item which, I am sure, will appeal to all your Lordships. The pensions of the widows of the sowars and the sepoys are now 5 rupees and 4 rupees respectively. The Committee now propose that there shall be one pension of 8 rupees, with 2 rupees for each child. Some of these poor women were widowed more than six years ago, and, with the present high prices in India, these additions will be most welcome in a very large number of humble homes. I think that the widows' pensions might have been increased before this. I am afraid that nothing has been done up to the present time. As I have said, the need of a contented Army in India was never so great as it is now, because never was agitation so dangerous as it is at this moment. I sincerely hope that the noble Earl will be able to say that this portion of the Report will be acted upon with the least possible delay.

THE EARL OF LYTTON: My Lords, I much regret that I am unable to give my noble friend any specific information in answer to his question at the present time. Some of the recommendations in Sections 4 and 5 of Part V of the Esher Committee's

Lord Sydenham.

Report have already been approved. Some are still under consideration. The question of when they can be carried into effect will depend upon when financial provision can be made. At this moment the Budget provisions for them are under discussion between the Government of India and the Secretary of State, and it would be impossible for me, therefore, until a decision has been arrived at upon that, to tell the noble Lord at what date effect will be given to any particular one of these provisions.

I can, however, assure him that I entirely agree with what he has said about the immense importance at the present time of ensuring contentment in the Army in India. It is obvious that that must always be a matter of great concern to the Executive Government, and I agree with him that it is particularly important at the present time. I can assure him that both on the part of the Government of India and of the Secretary of State in Council the recommendations of this Committee are receiving sympathetic consideration. On the part of both these authorities there is every desire to carry out the recommendations of the Committee as soon as the financial situation will allow. If the noble Lord had put this Question at a later date, or if he cares to repeat it, I may be able to tell him as soon as a decision is come to on the Budget of this year what provision could be made this year, but until that decision is arrived at I fear I cannot give him more information.

LORD SYDENHAM: I beg to thank the noble Earl for his assurances which I am sure will be carried out.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 1st March, 1921.

GOVERNMENT OF BURMA BILL. [H.L.]

THE EARL OF CRAWFORD: My Lords, on behalf of the EARL OF LYTTON, I beg to introduce a Bill for applying to Burma the provisions of the Government of India Act with respect to Governors and Provinces, and for other purposes connected therewith, and to move that it be read a first time.

Moved, That the Bill be now read 1^a.—*(The Earl of Crawford.)*

On Question, Bill read 1^a, and to be printed.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Wednesday, 2nd March, 1921.

THE ARMY IN INDIA.

LORD SYDENHAM rose to draw attention to the proposed reduction of the Indian Army, and to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India what units of each arm it is intended to abolish; whether the late Commander-in-Chief approved of this reduction; and to move to resolve,

“That, having regard to the present situation in India, any reduction below pre-war strength of the military forces is undesirable.”

The noble Lord said: My Lords, I fancy all of you must have noticed the statement in the newspapers, definitely announcing a reduction in the Indian Army. The number of regiments which it is proposed to abolish has been stated, and if this plan were carried out it would lead to a most dangerous reduction of the military forces in India, at the present time. Already serious misgivings and discontent have arisen among the fighting classes of the Punjab, in regard to these proposed reductions. I understand that the whole question was considered by the Government of India before the retirement of the late Commander-in-Chief, and that it was shelved on account of his very strong opposition. Now it is re-opened when the new Commander-in-Chief has arrived, and before he can have had time to master the intricacies of the Indian situation, and I must assume that he has acquiesced at least in a very considerable reduction of the Indian Army.

The special circumstances of the Boer war led to some military conclusions which proved entirely fallacious in the late war, because the circumstances were so absolutely different, and it may be that deductions as fallacious were drawn from the late war in France—conclusions which could not possibly be applied to the totally different conditions in India and the East generally. I know that the troops that were sent from France to Mesopotamia had to unlearn much that they had acquired, before they were able to grasp the new conditions in which they found themselves. I can understand quite well the arguments which may be put forward on this occasion. It may be said that aeroplanes and armoured cars, and motor transport generally, have rendered cavalry almost

unnecessary, and would even justify the reduction of the infantry forces. For myself, I do not believe that the functions of cavalry have ended, even in Western Europe, although I am sure that the forces which have hitherto been employed will be diminished; but in India the case is totally different, and cavalry remains and will, I believe, always remain, a most important arm in that country. For restoring order and preventing disturbance mounted men are, and will always be, a most important instrument. Their mere presence may often suffice to stop disorder, where infantry would be obliged to shoot, and therefore it may be sometimes humanitarian to have cavalry present instead of infantry. Aeroplanes, as many of your Lordships know, have proved somewhat disappointing in the frontier warfare, and now that severe restrictions have been placed upon the use of aeroplanes in India they will be less than ever suited for dealing with riots. Aeroplanes will always have most important uses, but I maintain that they cannot be substituted for cavalry in India.

Your Lordships will remember that during the Mutiny it was found necessary to raise many additional regiments of cavalry, and those regiments have since won fame on many battlefields. Yet it seems to be contemplated that the greatest relative reduction is to be in the cavalry arm. The Indian cavalry really constitutes the flower of the Indian Army. They are drawn from the pick of the martial classes of India. The Indian cavalry are very fine horsemen and come from the old yeoman classes of India. Every sowar has a stake in the country, and is intensely proud of his regiment. I may say that the *esprit de corps* of the Indian Cavalry is a quality *sui generis*. The cavalry has been conspicuous for its loyalty to the Crown in the past, and all the efforts made to undermine its allegiance have signally failed. Is this a time, when lawlessness is rampant in many parts of India, to weaken a force on which the maintenance of law and order must depend?

The duties of the Indian Army may be said to be three-fold—two domestic and one external. In the first place, it has to maintain the authority of the supreme Government. In the next place, it has to maintain the authority of the protected Princes and Chiefs of India. As your Lordships know, there are six hundred of these people, some of them with large

States and some with very small States, but in all cases the military forces which they maintain are very small, because at the back of them are the forces of the Crown to maintain order. If it were not for those forces the great States of India would be saddled with large military expenditure from which they now escape. Lastly, the Indian Army has to protect the lives of our countrymen, women and children, scattered broadcast among 315,000,000 of most excitable Asiatics. I must not attempt to state in detail the circumstances which the Secretary of State has described, and most accurately described, as "extremely dangerous." I will only say that our rule is now undoubtedly being treated with contempt in many parts of India, and that a violent anti-British agitation is proceeding, with complete or almost complete impunity. Mr. Gandhi's non-co-operation movement will certainly fail in some parts of its programme, but, together with the Khilafat agitation, it has resulted in the spread of race hatred to an extent which has never before been approached in the time of our connection with India. Those two movements together must leave behind them a legacy of evil for years to come.

I may remind your Lordships of the very dangerous rebellion in the spring of 1919. The conspiracy which led to this rebellion was far more elaborate and far more wide-reaching than that which produced the great Mutiny, and in the debates in your Lordships' House in regard to that rebellion many facts were not brought out as they ought to have been. The rebellion was intended to coincide with an Afghan invasion, and when we look back we can see that it was very nearly a successful rebellion. It was put down by military forces, employed just in time by the worthy successors of the men who saved the Punjab, and who, in saving the Punjab, saved India in 1857. Those men were, however, very differently treated by their countrymen compared with their successors in 1919. The rebellion was put down only because the Indian Army proved true to its salt in spite of the tremendous efforts that were made to corrupt it. We dare not ignore this plain warning and risk the lives of our own people and of the Indians themselves.

In the second place, upon the Indian Army rests the duty of suppressing the many violent conflicts which arise out of the difference of creeds or sections among the Indian people. Of these conflicts

Lord Sydenham.

we have had some terrible examples in recent years. In Behar and at Katarpur many Moslems were killed by Hindus, who were led by prominent people and not, as has been stated by the noble Lord the late Under-Secretary for India, by some ignorant villagers. Those two outbreaks ranged over a very large area of the country, and only the military forces prevented a much greater conflagration. The other day there were serious agrarian outrages in Oudh, and those outrages were undoubtedly fomented for political purposes, and then, on Sunday before last, there was a violent conflict at Nankana Saheb, a small town about forty miles from Lahore. In that conflict large loss of life occurred, but we do not know the figures accurately.

The circumstances of that conflict are somewhat obscure, but Nankana Saheb is the birthplace of the Guru Nanak, and is therefore a very famous Sikh shrine. So far as we know the Mahant, the hereditary custodian of the shrine, was attacked by a mob of extremists, and he defended himself as well as he could, employing for his defence Pathan mercenaries. I do not know the reason, but it is remarkable that the Sikh high priest should have called in Pathan soldiers to help him in his fight against the extremists. I hope the noble Earl will some day give particulars about this very significant and sinister occurrence. I cannot help tracing it to the weakness and vacillation of the Government of India in dealing with some other cases of sacred shrines. Troops arrived in the evening, but too late to prevent a heavy loss of life, and most of the bodies were at once burned, so that it may be very difficult to obtain the actual figures of the losses.

There have been constant strikes, all fomented by political agitators, and often attended by violence. It has been frequently necessary to use troops to restore order, and that I am afraid is likely to happen in many places in the future. I beg your Lordships to bear these recent outbreaks in mind when considering whether our Indian Army ought now to be reduced. I should like to point out that the British white force in India is now short of its pre-war strength by one cavalry regiment and six infantry battalions, although there have been added, I believe, five armoured car companies as some substitute for the six battalions.

In the third place the Army is required for the defence of the frontier, where, as

we all know, the turbulent tribes are constantly giving trouble, and where those tribes are now far better armed than they were twenty years ago. Less than two years ago the Army had to repel an Afghan invasion which was intended to coincide with the revolution in the Punjab and with the cutting of all the railways in the Province. What is now going on we do not know, but it is an ominous thing that the negotiations are so protracted as they have been, and when General Ironside is withdrawn from North-West Persia almost anything may happen. If all North Persia were to go Bolshevik, as is quite possible, how would that affect the policy of Afghanistan? Already Bolshevism is a very real danger in India. Mr. Ghandi has proclaimed publicly that he prefers Bolshevism to British rule, and Mr. Bepin Chandra Pal, who is actually his vice-regent in Bengal, when inciting the Calcutta students to non-co-operation, spoke of the "divine idea" of Bolshevism.

Recently *The Times* published some startling revelations of a meeting of the Third International which took place at Bremen. It was then stated that there were Bolshevik schools at Delhi and Benares under the nose of the British authorities. It was also said that 900 Indians had been trained in Bolshevism, and it was further stated that some Indian Bolsheviks had been present, and also Bolsheviks from Ceylon, at a meeting at Samarkand. This may be exaggerated, but undoubtedly Bolshevik principles are being instilled in many parts of India, and undoubtedly many Indians are being trained in these foul doctrines.

A Government which has lost £25,000,000 sterling by vainly attempting to stabilise the exchange must naturally economise. The loss incurred by that unfortunate experiment was very nearly one third of the normal net Revenue of India. The new Councils will certainly do all that they can to cut down military expenditure, and they now seem to be passing Resolutions which, if adopted, would quickly bring our authority in India to an end.

Meanwhile, we are wholly responsible for law and order among more than 315,000,000 of very excitable and very credulous people, to whom law and order is the first need and the first necessity of their lives. Surely we dare not take risks at a time like this which may involve most dangerous possibilities for the future of

India. It is known to everyone who serves in India that our margin of strength at any time is a narrow one, and the necessary military charges must, I think, be met by economies in other directions than in the loss of actual military strength. For the reasons which I have tried to give the House as briefly as possible, I strongly urge that the pre-war strength of the Indian Army shall not be reduced, and I venture to appeal to your Lordships to pass my Motion because it will strengthen the hands of the official and the non-official friends of India, who are seriously alarmed at the thought of any reduction at a time so critical as the present. I beg to put my Question and to move.

Moved to resolve, "That, having regard to the present situation in India, any reduction below pre-war strength of the military forces is undesirable."—(*Lord Sydenham.*)

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (THE EARL OF LYTTON): My Lords, I very much hope that my noble friend will not press his Motion to a Division this afternoon; not, I need hardly assure him, because I have any reason to complain of his raising the matter, but merely because I am unable to-day to give your Lordships the information to which I think you are entitled before you can come to a decision upon my noble friend's Motion. The matter raised by Lord Sydenham is not only one of the greatest importance, but he is himself so weighty and recognised an authority on the subject that the considerations put forward by him will necessarily deserve the closest attention on the part of your Lordships. The noble Lord has, in a very interesting speech, told us what, in his opinion, are the uses of the Army in India to-day, and has emphasised more especially his opinion as to the value of cavalry in that country. He has further developed a description of the present situation in India, which, in his opinion, renders the maintenance of the strength of the Army in India vital to our safety.

I do not propose to follow my noble friend in the arguments which he has addressed to your Lordships; not because they do not deserve to be dealt with, but because they are all based upon an assumption that a decision has been arrived at to diminish the Army in India. If the Government were in a position to announce such a decision I should feel called upon to

deal with the arguments of my noble friend. I may say, in passing, that some of the incidents to which he referred are matters upon which I should, of course, be willing to give him the fullest information if I had had notice of his intention to raise them, but without such notice I am not prepared at this moment to deal with some of the detailed incidents which he has mentioned.

The position with regard to the Army in India at this moment is this. Certain reductions of pre-war strength have already been decided upon, as was announced by the Secretary of State in the House of Commons a week ago. Those reductions were recommended to us by the unanimous opinion of the Government of India. Some of them, I think, were suggested by the late Commander-in-Chief, and further reductions were recommended by the present Commander-in-Chief in India, but those proposals that have been approved were recommended to us by the unanimous opinion of the Government of India. They are as follow :—To reduce the number of Indian cavalry regiments from thirty-nine before the war to twenty-one. This will be accomplished by a process of amalgamation, regiments being selected for absorption into others, with due regard for historical associations and traditions. Battle honours of both regiments will be borne by the one remaining in each pair, and officers' messes will be combined. Regimental plate and trophies will thus be retained in suitable custody and future expansion, if necessary, will be simplified. As regards infantry, the number of units in India will be the same as before the war, though establishments will be smaller. That is the position with regard to decisions which have already been reached.

The question of the final post-war strength of the Army in India, however, is at this moment the subject of most anxious consideration by the Secretary of State and his Council. I can assure my noble friend that the Secretary of State and his Council view the matter solely from the point of view of what are the considerations of safety, having regard both to the external and the internal situation in India. How he can best be satisfied as to what the military necessities of the position are is a matter upon which he has expressed his intention of making a statement in Parliament this day week.

At this moment, therefore, I am not in a position to give to your Lordships the

The Earl of Lytton.

information which I think you are entitled to have before you can come to a decision upon my noble friend's Motion. If he raises the Question at a future date I shall be happy to give him full information on the subject, and I am confident that I shall be able to persuade my noble friend, and indeed your Lordships, that the Government are taking such steps as our safety and the military needs of the position in India require. Until, however, I have that information I am not in a position to say anything more on the subject to-day. It is for those reasons, and those reasons only, that I hope my noble friend will not press his Motion on this occasion.

THE EARL OF MIDLETON: My Lords, I think the noble Earl's statement may be regarded as reassuring. I gather that if any serious moves in the direction of further changes in the Indian Army are in contemplation, your Lordships will have an opportunity of discussing them before any decision is arrived at. That is a most important proviso. I think the noble Earl will be the first to recognise that after the great strain which has been put on all the Forces, including the Indian Army, it would be highly undesirable, especially while a very large number of the troops are still abroad, to come to a decision which looks like adding considerably to the weight which falls upon the Indian Army.

In addition to that, anything which is likely to change substantially the proportion between the British and Indian troops in India would be regarded, I am quite certain, with very serious concern by all those who have had to carry on the administration of either country in past years. In particular, at the present moment, as my noble friend has pointed out, there are circumstances connected with India which make it desirable to proceed with very great caution in this matter. I understand from the noble Earl, apart from what was announced by the Secretary of State last week, that we may hope that full opportunities for further consideration will be given before any serious step is taken.

THE MARQUESS OF CREWE: My Lords, I have very little to add to what has been said, because I understand that my noble friend on the cross benches is invited not to press his Motion on the ground that the whole matter is still *sub judice* and, therefore, it would be premature to express an

opinion on the point involved in his Motion. There is only one question I should like to ask the noble Earl. I understand that a considerable reduction in the strength of the Indian cavalry has already been sanctioned by the amalgamation of certain regiments, maintaining as far as possible, I have no doubt, the old historical names, and I should hope the uniforms to which so much credit attaches and which are so highly thought of by Indians generally.

Can the noble Earl tell me whether this decision to reduce the Indian cavalry was arrived at owing to a new factor—the existence of an air force in India—or was it arrived at, so to speak, strictly on the merits as between cavalry and infantry; because I confess unless the new conditions brought about by the creation of an air force may be held to account for it, I find myself in a good deal of agreement with the noble Lord on the cross benches that a reduction of the cavalry in India *ipso facto* would be a misfortune.

THE EARL OF LYTTON: My Lords, in reply to the question which the noble Marquess has addressed to me, I rather hesitate to give an authoritative opinion on such a matter without notice, but my impression certainly is that the existence of an air force played a large part in the decision arrived at upon this question and that the recommendations made by the Government of India were made having regard to their view of the importance of cavalry at the present time in the light of recent experience. With regard to the question addressed to me by the noble Earl, the Secretary of State gave an assurance in another place—an assurance which I am happy to repeat to your Lordships here—that, apart from the reductions to which I have already referred, no further decisions with regard to reductions in the Army in India will be taken until he has made his statement in Parliament next week. When that statement has been made, of course, it will be open to any one of your Lordships to raise the question here, if you think fit, either in the form of a Question or a Motion. Until that statement is made no further action will be taken in the matter.

LORD SYDENHAM: I beg to thank the noble Earl for his partial explanation of what has happened. I take it from him that it has already been finally decided

that the number of cavalry regiments in India is to be reduced from thirty-nine to twenty-one. To that extent my protest, I am afraid, has come too late. I can only say that I regard the reduction of no less than eighteen of the splendid cavalry regiments of India as a positive disaster at the present moment. If thirty-nine cavalry regiments were necessary before the war, what a very exaggerated number it must have been if only twenty-one regiments are required now, when the whole of India is disturbed from one end to the other. I understand from the noble Earl that the House will have an opportunity of discussing any further reductions that may be made before a final decision is actually taken, and in that case I most willingly withdraw my Motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 8th March, 1921.

GOVERNMENT OF BURMA BILL. [H.L.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (THE EARL OF LYTTON): My Lords, the Bill which is the subject of the two Motions standing in my name on the Paper is a very short document, which does not require much explanation, so far, at any rate, as its text is concerned. It is practically a one-clause Bill, the effect of which is to constitute Burma a Governor's Province within the meaning of the Government of India Act. If the Bill becomes law a Committee will proceed to Burma to make inquiries locally and issue recommendations with regard to the division of the functions of government and the distribution of the franchise, exactly in the same way as was done in the case of India. Subject to rules which may be based on the Report of that Committee, this Bill, if it becomes law, will establish in Burma the principle of diarchy, which is now in force in India.

With regard to the Bill itself, I have only two things to say. The first is with regard to the proviso to Clause 1. Provision is made in the Government of India Act that at least 70 per cent. of the members of the Legislative Council in a Governor's Province shall be elected members, and not more than

20 per cent. of them nominated. Under this proviso we propose that the minimum of elected members in the Burma Legislative Council should be 60 per cent., instead of 70 per cent. The only reason for this proviso is that in Burma there is a large mixture of distinctive races which differentiate it to some extent from India. There are, for instance, over 1,000,000 Karens, 800,000 Indians and 120,000 Chinese, and it is only in order to secure adequate representation for those communities, without the necessity of establishing a community franchise, that we propose to have a larger number of nominated members in the Council of Burma than is the case in India.

The other point about which I want to say a word is with regard to something which is not in the Bill. There is a very strong feeling in Burma that this Bill, in some way or other, should mark the fact that Burma is geographically separate and distinct from India. The Government of India have pressed us very strongly to insert a clause in the Bill which will make the title of the Viceroy in future "Governor-General of India and Burma," and in that way to mark the fact that Burma and India are two distinct places. In the first draft of the Bill we did what the Government originally asked us to do, and we inserted a clause in this sense, but further consideration of the matter has led us to doubt very much whether, so long as the definition of British India includes Burma, and so long as the title of His Majesty is Emperor of India, we could properly describe the Governor-General as Governor-General of Burma and India. Accordingly, we have omitted this clause from the Bill, but we are very anxious, if possible, to find some way to meet Burmese sentiment on this point. And if your Lordships agree to refer this Bill to the Standing Joint Committee on Indian Affairs, we shall call the attention of the Committee to this point, and ask them to see whether any means can be found, either in this Bill or in some other way, of making the distinction which is required. That is all I have to say about the text of the Bill itself.

I ought to say something about the reasons for introducing it, and I should like to make it plain to your Lordships that there is really no necessity, in order to constitute Burma a Governor's Province under the Government of India Act, for

The Earl of Lytton.

proceeding by Act of Parliament at all, because by Section 52 (a) of the Government of India Act the Governor-General is empowered to do this by notification, after consulting the Local Government and the Local Legislature. And had the Government of India and the Secretary of State been in agreement as to their policy, that I imagine would have been the course which would have been pursued. But as, unfortunately, there is a difference of opinion between them as to the Constitution which should be set up in Burma, the Secretary of State has decided to give to Parliament an opportunity of hearing both sides of the case and deciding between them.

I think I ought to give to your Lordships a history of the negotiations which have led up to the introduction of this Bill, and in doing so I will be as brief as possible. In the Montagu-Chelmsford Report, which was the basis of the Government of India Act, the authors expressly stated that Burma had not been included in their survey, and, after giving their reasons, they concluded as follows—

"We therefore set aside the problem of Burma's political evolution for separate and future consideration."

Accordingly, therefore, Burma was not included in the Government of India Bill. When that Bill went before the Joint Committee of the two Houses, to which it was referred, the evidence before that Committee was that of a deputation from Burma, which urged the inclusion of Burma in the Bill, on the ground that there was no justification for making a distinction between Burma and India, and that the form of government ought to be the same in both cases.

The Joint Committee stated in their report as follows—

"After hearing evidence the Committee have not advised that Burma should be included within the scheme. They point out that the Burmese have deserved and should receive a constitution analogous to that provided in this Bill for their Indian fellow-subjects, but Burma is only by accident part of the responsibility of the Governor-General of India. The Burmese are as distinct from the Indians in race and in language as they are from the British."

When the Bill reached the Committee stage in the House of Commons an Amendment was moved to include Burma within its scope. This Amendment was rejected by the Government on the ground that more time was required for consideration of the

matter; but on that occasion a definite pledge was given by the Secretary of State in the following words—

“ I quite agree with the Joint Committee that Burma is not India, but Burma must get an analogous grant of self-government, a similar grant of self-government, subject to differences in the local conditions of Burma.”

The exclusion of Burma from the Bill naturally created a good deal of resentment amongst the people of that country, and ever since the passage of the Government of India Act there has been a growing impatience at the delay in fulfilling the pledge which I have just read to your Lordships, given by the Secretary of State for India.

I will give your Lordships some evidence as to the opinion of the Burmese on this subject, but I must complete the history which I am giving to your Lordships. The delay which has been complained of has been due to the necessity for investigating the matter both here and in India. During the greater part of 1919, and during the early summer of 1920, correspondence was proceeding between the Government of India and the Government of Burma respecting the Constitution which had been proposed by the Lieut.-Governor of Burma, and after various alterations and amendments had been agreed to, the proposals of the Lieut.-Governor were adopted by the Government of India, and were published last summer in a White Paper which was presented to Parliament and bears the number Cmd. 746. It is entitled “ Proposals of the Government of India for a new Constitution for Burma.” That White Paper contains all the correspondence which passed between the two Governments, and sets out in full detail the form of Constitution proposed.

Briefly stated, the proposal of the Government of India provided for (1) a wide extension of local self-government; (2) a Legislative Council of ninety-two members, with a non-official majority; (3) a nominated Executive Council of six members, divided into three Committees, each with an official and a non-official member. In the event of disagreement either was to have a right of appeal to the Governor, or to the full Council. Only two of the non-official members were to be Burmans in the first instance. That, stated in the shortest possible terms, is the skeleton of the proposals of the Government of India.

Their scheme was carefully considered by the Secretary of State, who appointed a special Committee, presided over by my noble friend Lord Meston, to examine and report to him upon it. This Committee, my Lords, by a majority, condemned the scheme, on the ground that it did not give to the Burmans any executive or administrative responsibility; that it did not provide the training requisite to fit the people for self-government; and that the Council system, similar to what is known as the Morley-Minto Council system in India, which it sought to reproduce, had not proved so successful in India as to justify its introduction into Burma. In the opinion of that Committee the pledge given by the Secretary of State could be fulfilled only by the application to Burma of diarchy in some form or another, and accordingly they recommended the application of that principle to Burma. The recommendations of this Committee were unanimously adopted by the India Council, and the Secretary of State invited the Government of India to reconsider their proposals. The Government of India replied that they could not agree to the proposal of the Secretary of State to apply the principle of diarchy to Burma. They were not willing to make Burma a Governor's Province. Therefore, the Secretary of State decided, in view of the great importance of the matter, to subject the issue between them to the judgment of Parliament.

That is the history of this Bill. I think I ought now to give to your Lordships some evidence with regard to the opinion of the people of Burma on this matter. One can only gather the public opinion of a country which does not possess representative institutions from its Press, from public meetings, and from deputations, or petitions, and judging from all these sources of information there can, I think, be no doubt whatever that the general sense of opinion in Burma is in favour of a measure of self-government which shall be at least equal to that which has been given to India, and is opposed to the Constitution proposed by the Government of India. About this time last year, when the Government of India proposals were first published in Burma, three papers, the *Rangoon Gazette*, the *Rangoon Times* and the *Burma Spectator*, all under European editorship, expressed general approval of the Government of India's proposals, and advised the people of Burma to accept

them as a reasonable instalment of what was promised to them; but, with the exception of those three papers, all the other organs of public opinion in Burma rejected the proposals of the Government of India, and insisted upon the fact that there should be no differentiation between Burma and India, and that the principle of diarchy ought to be established in Burma if the pledge given by the Secretary of State were to be carried out.

Then, if we look at public meetings, we find that public meetings, small and large, have been held in the country during the last twelve months, and, in particular, there were large mass meetings in March, May and October last year, and again at the beginning of this year, at which resolutions were passed all in the same sense, calling upon the Government to introduce into Burma a measure of self-government at least equal to that which had been introduced into India, and condemning as inadequate the proposals put forward by the Government of India. Lastly a deputation from the Young Men's Buddhist Association, which represents the advanced school of political thought in Burma—the Young Burma Party—came to this country, and remained here throughout the summer to urge upon the Government the course which I have already indicated.

The evidence to which, I think, I must attach greatest importance is that of the opinion of the non-official members of the Legislative Council of Burma. That Council met on February 12 of this year, and after hearing a statement from the Lieutenant-Governor as to the history of the negotiations, the Council, at which all the non-official members, numbering sixteen, were present, passed the following resolution—

“That this Council recommends the Lieutenant-Governor of Burma to urge the Secretary of State for India that the measure of reform to be granted to Burma by the British Parliament should be at least the same as that for the major Provinces of India, leaving the matters relating to the franchise and the division of subjects into transferred and reserved for full discussion with representatives of the people before final decision.”

Two amendments were moved to that resolution, one asking for complete Dominion self-government, and the other asking for further delay, in order that the matter might be investigated; in other words, an Amendment in a more extreme sense, and an Amendment in a more moderate sense. Both were rejected, and the resolution which I have read to your Lordships was carried by a majority, in which

The Earl of Lytton.

thirteen out of the sixteen members voted for the resolution, two voted against, and one abstained.

In transmitting this information the Government of Burma make this significant admission. They say that the general impression of the discussion is that, as a result of the Joint Select Committee's recommendation in 1919, and the Secretary of State for India's announcement in 1920, it is no longer possible to differentiate Burma very materially from the Indian Provinces. Although the opinion of Burma itself is undoubtedly in favour of the policy embodied in this Bill, the Government of India do not agree with us. I wish to be perfectly frank with your Lordships upon this matter. There is a difference of opinion, which we have unfortunately been unable to reconcile. What then in these circumstances ought the Secretary of State to do? Further delay was out of the question. Already nearly two years have passed since the pledge to which I have referred was given. And, as I have told your Lordships, we have been pressed, with ever greater and greater insistence, by the Burmans to fulfil that pledge. Further delay would only invite agitation in that country, and already the policy of this Bill, which two years ago represented perhaps the opinion of the advanced section in that country, now represents the opinion of the moderate section. As your Lordships know, in a matter of this sort the longer the delay in carrying out a pledge which has been given in Parliament the more certain it is that the demands made upon you will grow in extravagance and intensity.

The Secretary of State could not have adopted the policy of the Government of India with which he disagreed, and which he was firmly convinced would not only not satisfy opinion in Burma but would not set up a satisfactory form of Government. He could, of course, under Section 52 (a) of the Government of India Act, have overridden the Government of India and have instructed them to apply the Act by notification. Instead of that course the Secretary of State has decided to submit the whole case to Parliament. I contend that in these circumstances that was the proper course for him to take. I want to make plain to your Lordships exactly what it is that I am asking you to do this afternoon. Clearly the brief summary of the transactions which I have

given to your Lordships is wholly insufficient to enable you this afternoon to come to a decision in principle upon the matter. I do not think it would be possible, in the course of a Second Reading debate, for your Lordships to be put in possession in sufficient detail of all the arguments on both sides of this question—arguments which have formed the subject of long Dispatches between the Government of India and the Secretary of State.

Therefore, what I am asking you to do this afternoon is to allow this Bill to go before the Standing Joint Committee on Indian Affairs, which your Lordships have already agreed to establish, together with the Government of India proposals, and to allow that Committee to investigate the whole matter in detail. The names of those of your Lordships whom it is proposed to make members of this Joint Committee appear on the Order Paper this afternoon, and you will see that they are all men of great experience, distinction and authority. That Committee will have placed before it all the Documents relevant to the issue, and all the Papers which have passed between the Government of India and ourselves. They will be able, if they wish, to hear evidence from the Government of India and from representative people in Burma, and when they have fully investigated the whole matter they will make a Report to Parliament. The Bill, therefore, will come back to your Lordships with the recommendations of that Committee. They may recommend that the Bill be accepted, or that the proposals of the Government of India should, as an alternative, be accepted, or they may propose some course between the two. But when your Lordships are asked, at a later stage, to decide, you will have the advantage of the opinions of that Committee which will be before you in print.

I notice that my noble friend on the cross benches (Lord Sydenham) has put down an Amendment for the rejection of this Bill. I am not surprised. The noble Lord has never concealed his hostility to the system of diarchy. He is opposed to its establishment in India, and it is only natural that he should object to its extension to Burma. Though, of course, I do not share the views of my noble friend, I certainly respect them, in view of his high authority and experience. But I doubt if the noble Lord quite appreciates what would be the effect if his Amendment were carried at this stage. If it were carried

this afternoon it would not have the effect which he desires. It would only deprive Parliament of the opportunity, which we are seeking to give it, of coming to a decision with a knowledge of the relevant circumstances. I have already told your Lordships that I am not asking you to approve of our policy, even in principle, this afternoon. I am only asking you to allow this Bill to go before the Joint Committee and to be examined by them, together with the alternative proposals of the Government of India, and unless this Bill is read a Second Time it will be impossible so to refer it.

The noble Lord on the cross benches will himself, I hope, be a member of that Committee. Ample opportunity will be given to him of explaining his views both on the Committee and also, at a later stage, when the Bill comes back to your Lordships' House. But if the Motion to reject the Bill were carried this afternoon, the only result would be that the Government would be forced to carry out the policy embodied in the Bill upon their own responsibility, and Parliament would lose the opportunity of arbitrating upon the matter. The Government has often been accused of calling upon your Lordships to come to a decision upon important matters of legislation without giving due time for their consideration and discussion. I hope that on this occasion we shall be given credit for having adopted a different procedure. We have introduced this Bill at the very beginning of the session; we propose to submit it to the detailed consideration of a Joint Committee of acknowledged experts, and when your Lordships are finally asked to pronounce judgment upon the policy of the Bill, you will have the advantage of basing that judgment upon the Report of the Joint Committee on the whole case. I submit that it would be impossible to treat Parliament with more consideration than we propose to show in this case. In view of those circumstances I sincerely hope that your Lordships will support us in the policy which we recommend to you, give the Bill a Second Reading this afternoon, and allow it to be referred to the Joint Committee.

Moved, That the Bill be now read 2^a.—
(*The Earl of Lytton.*)

LORD SYDENHAM had given notice, on the Motion for the Second Reading, to move that the Bill be read a second time this day six months. The noble Lord

said: My Lords, when I first glanced through this little Bill I thought it was a harmless, innocent measure for raising the *status* of the Lieutenant-Governor of Burma. But when I came to consider it I found that its object was to impose upon Burma the impossible diarchical system which is already leading to administrative chaos throughout India. I must not repeat the arguments which I offered long ago against this system. It is a system unknown to constitutional history, and it is a system which the Secretary of State himself once described as a very dangerous experiment. When he and the Viceroy toured the principal towns of India and collected materials for that most remarkable Report which they published, they never visited Burma, as I think the noble Earl told us. It might, therefore, fairly be said that at that time they did not consider that Burma was suited to the application of this system, and, to that extent, this Bill must be something of an afterthought on the part of the Secretary of State.

In Burma, as in India, there was a need for associating more of the people of the country in the Administration. There was also a need of broadening the basis of the Councils in both of those countries. Under the Morley system that basis had been found to be not sufficiently wide. In Burma, just as in India, it is our object to lead the people by gradual and safe steps towards the goal of self-government. The Lieutenant-Governor of Burma, Sir Reginald Craddock, therefore prepared a scheme in which the complications and the dangers of the diarchy were carefully avoided, and, after some discussion and with some slight changes, the Government of India approved of the scheme and determined that the diarchy was not suitable for Burma. I understand that at the Committee to which the noble Earl has referred, two very distinguished experts on Burma were present and were consulted, and I understand that they both disapproved of the application of this scheme to Burma. That, I believe, is the genesis of the Bill now before your Lordships. Therefore, it comes before this House against the wishes of the Government of India, against the wishes of the Government of Burma, and against the opinions of two of the most distinguished experts upon Burma now in this country.

Any one who knows the country must see that the agitation which has been

Lord Sydenham.

created there is really a most insignificant one. It has been engineered largely from India, and has been assisted by an ex-civil servant who, while he was in Burma, showed very little sympathy with the people and has since developed what I can only call revolutionary tendencies. The Burmese people differ from the people of India in race, language, religion, hereditary customs, ideals, education, land system, and civilisation generally, and the physical characteristics of Burma differ as far as possible from those of India. Thus it may be said that the two countries and the two peoples have really nothing whatever in common except a hot climate. In these circumstances I submit to your Lordships most humbly that to impose upon Burma the same artificial Constitution—a Constitution which, from my point of view, is quite impracticable—is a thing that we ought not to do at the present moment.

Whatever may be thought of the representative character of Mrs. Besant and of the nineteen members of the Viceroy's Council who formulated a scheme of their own and started the present agitation in India in the autumn of 1916, when the whole Empire was fighting for its life, it is at least certain that more than 300,000,000 people in India knew nothing of these people, and knew nothing whatever of their proposals. In spite of what the noble Earl has said, I do not think we have any real evidence of the wishes of the Burmese people in this matter. All of us who have been in India know perfectly well how the Press is run, and how easy it is to arrange a meeting on any subject whatever, and to pass any resolution which is put before it. Surely it is plain that the number of Burmese who can understand what the diarchy means must be infinitesimal. I am afraid there are not many members of this House who could get up and define exactly what the diarchy means and how it will work in the administration of India.

In India, as your Lordships must know, the dominant political faction at the present moment has contemptuously rejected the Government of India Act which we are about to impose upon Burma, and it is doing its best, it is making frantic efforts, to render all government in India impossible. At least before we try this dangerous experiment in Burma, we might wait and see how it is going to work out in India. At least we could wait until the new Viceroy has gone out and had time to

grasp the very complex conditions which have arisen. The Viceroy and Secretary of State declared their intention of "deliberately disturbing the placid, pathetic contentment" of the people. That was distinctly a revolutionary policy and it has been most successful in India, as I said in this House at the time it was certain to be. The result of passing this Bill will undoubtedly be to disturb the people—a singularly happy and contented people—and it will arouse in Burma a corresponding agitation to that which is running through India from one end to the other at the present time. For these reasons I ask that your Lordships will postpone this Bill until we really know where we stand. I have no doubt that before long we shall see the inevitable results of the policy which the Secretary of State has pursued in making great concessions to all the disloyal elements, in throwing over all our friends in India and also the great Services which minister to India, and in strengthening the forces of our enemies, while at the same time cutting down the only means of protection of our countrymen and women and the loyal people in India. I am certain that the results of that policy will before long be very evident in Burma unless the Secretary of State be persuaded to stay his hand at least for a time.

Only yesterday the papers had a very ominous telegram from Delhi dated February 3—

"In the Council of State to-day Mr. S. Sastri moved various proposals limiting the use of fire-arms and urging that one hour's notice be given before crowds are fired on by civil or military order. General Lord Rawlinson strongly objected to certain proposals of Sir William Vincent and said that the Government would be extremely lucky if the country escaped sporadic disorders in the next month."

In *The Times* report it was added that Lord Rawlinson said that "owing to the attacks made upon them officers were already showing signs of losing their initiative." That shows that the Commander-in-Chief was naturally alarmed at the present state of India, and also that he was strongly opposed to the attitude of one of his colleagues in the Executive Council of India. I think we could hardly have a plainer warning than that given in the telegram which I have just read. It has been decided to reduce the number of cavalry regiments in India which, as I explained last week, are the most potent safeguards that we have against the riots

which it is quite clear that the Commander-in-Chief now expects.

Instead of inflicting on Burma the conditions which are leading straight to anarchy in India at the present moment I ask the Government to consider the possibility of separating India from Burma altogether. That would exactly meet the situation, and it is the only way of meeting the facts and the sentiments to which the noble Earl has just referred. This policy would strongly appeal to the Burmese. They have a very real grievance in being governed from Simla, or from Delhi. Burma is the richest Province in India and has great wealth of undeveloped resources. Educated Burmese quite well know that their Province is being used as a milch cow for India, and that for a long time their progress has been retarded for the benefit of the other Provinces.

As a general principle I think that it would be much the best that India should be a self-contained country as regards its finances, and that it should not be allowed to draw upon what is essentially a foreign country. I think that Burma should control her own finances and should not be called upon to make good the deficiencies of the Budgets of Bengal and Bihar, which escape their fair share of taxation in India because of the permanent settlement imposed upon them long ago. Burma has a very long frontier line, marching with those of China and Siam, and very near to that of the French Protectorate in Indo-China. The frontier is a frontier of very great natural strength. It is much stronger than the north-west frontier in India, which is crossed by three different passes. The Burmese frontier is defended by military police maintained by the Government of Burma. To all Burma Lord Kitchener allocated only one brigade of troops, because of the extreme strength of that frontier.

There is one other point that is very little realised by people who have not been in the East. Caste is the dominant, you may say political, certainly social, force in India. In Sanskrit and in Hindi the word for caste is *varna* which means colour and it is upon colour that caste in the East is based. On account of the great admixture of blood, colour is no longer a distinctive characteristic of caste. But there is no doubt that the white caste was the highest caste in India, and though it is now very often not white, it retains the position

originally based on what was once its colour. The division between the yellow people and the brown people runs quite as deep as the division between the white people and the brown, or the black. The Burmans dislike, and bitterly resent, government by brown people, which must be their fate if this Bill passes into law. To them the authority of white people is far more acceptable. Placed as they are between China and India there is a great influx of Chinese and there will also be a great influx of Indians, and it may come about that the Burmese, as a race, may be submerged between these two other races on either side of them.

Separation would bring not only a great boon to the Burmese but, in a political sense, a great relief to the Government of India, which is very much overburdened at the present time. The effect of separation will be to avert in Burma the disorder and disorganisation that is now impending directly over India, and it would ensure great prosperity to the Burmese and also great benefit to the trade of the Empire. I am only afraid that this separation, which I believe must come some day, may be postponed until it is too late. In the last speech that Lord Beaconsfield made in this House he said, "The key of India is in London." I believe that London has lost the key of India and I beg the House not to throw away the key of Burma. I beg to move.

Amendment moved—

Leave out ("now") and insert at the end of the Motion ("this day six months").—(*Lord Sydenham.*)

LORD AMPHILL: My Lords, I would give a great deal, almost anything, if I could persuade your Lordships from taking the course of reading this Bill a second time, but I have small hope that the Amendment proposed by the noble Lord on the cross benches will succeed. In this case, as in the case of the Government of India Act, the object has been clear, and in the present state of disorder, the impotence of Parliament, and the suspension of constitutional government, legislative acts can take place which would have been utterly impossible at any other time. But I have some hopes of persuading your Lordships to perform that function which is proper to this House and to impose a wise delay upon legislation which has not been sufficiently considered.

Lord Sydenham.

I have an alternative course to suggest to your Lordships to that of rejecting the Bill on the Second Reading. My reason for venturing to make this proposal is simply this. What do we know about this Bill? What chance have we of learning anything at all about it? I admit that the noble Earl who moved the Second Reading of the Bill recognised that it was hardly a fair thing to ask your Lordships to assent to it, even in principle, and he fully admitted that we had had no opportunity of understanding the question. I hope your Lordships are not going to be "had" by the suggestion which he made in such a plausible manner. It is an entirely new thing in the Constitution—the only precedent is that of the Government of India Act—that this House, or the other House, should delegate its functions to a Committee. It is the business of Parliament to consider, and decide upon, the principles of legislation, and I maintain that that duty cannot be delegated to any Committee, however constituted; and, least of all, to a Committee which, in the opinion of a great many people outside this House, is a "packed" Committee, composed mainly of those who are friendly to the opinions of the Secretary of State. I suggest to your Lordships that to delegate and abrogate your functions in this way is a most dangerous constitutional innovation which may lead to consequences more far-reaching than anything we can imagine at the present moment.

All that we know at the moment is that two years ago a similar Committee told us that the form of government known as the diarchy was unsuitable for Burma, and your Lordships accepted that opinion almost without question. What has happened since then to induce your Lordships now to change your minds? Are you going to leave it to a Committee to tell you what you should think about this great question of principle? I challenge any noble Lord who is thinking of supporting this Bill to tell me what has happened during the last two years since this House agreed in principle to the statement that a diarchy was quite unsuitable for Burma.

The noble Earl admitted that there has been correspondence on this subject and he was perfectly frank in stating that there had been entire disagreement between the Secretary of State and the Government of India. Have your Lordships seen that correspondence? Do you not think you

ought to see it? Are you going to decide this question without knowing the opinions of the people of Burma, of the Government of Burma, and of the Government of India? The noble Earl tells us that the Secretary of State is most generously going to submit this question to the judgment of Parliament, although he himself might decide it offhand. If he is sincere in that intention he must put the case before Parliament. It is not sufficient to put the case before a Committee, in the appointment of which this House will have no voice at all. The whole case must be put before Parliament in the ordinary way, by the submission of the correspondence and Papers.

If your Lordships wish to part with the last shred of prestige this House still enjoys in public opinion, the way to do it is to take this Bill without consideration and hand it over to the judgment of a Committee. At the present time the majority of the people of all classes in this country are expecting the House of Lords to assert themselves as the sole remaining defenders of our personal liberties. That is the question. Our personal liberties are threatened, and many people in the wage-earning class, and among the Labour Party, consider that the House of Lords is the sole remaining defence against the bureaucratic arbitrariness of the present unconstitutional form of Government. Here is your chance of saying, "No, we are not going to take anything that is given to us, without consideration. We will proceed in the usual constitutional manner and decide ourselves whether or not legislative proposals are right and fair and just."

But if your Lordships do not like to reject this Bill on Second Reading, there is another, and a very easy, course. You can adjourn this debate until you get the Papers; until the Secretary of State has laid on the Table of this House those Papers, the existence of which he admitted, showing the arguments from both points of view. What could be more reasonable than that? What is the occasion for hurry? Your Lordships know that time in the East counts for very little, and that in Oriental countries a hundred years are but as yesterday. When it comes to a matter of a few months it is absolute nonsense to pretend that any harm can be done. The Secretary of State is trading on the belief that this House will funk the rejection of this Bill. Of course, it will be perfectly easy to raise the cry that the

House of Lords is once more opposing itself to reform. Your Lordships, I am sure, will not be afraid of that. You will not be opposing reform if you delay accepting the principle of this Bill.

The noble Earl assures you that if you passed the Second Reading you would not be accepting the principle of the Bill. That is a doctrine which is absolutely new and unknown to Parliament. It has always been held that if you pass the Second Reading of a Bill you accept the principle, and if your Lordships pass the Second Reading of this Bill and refer it to a Committee, when it comes back to this House and there is any objection taken on principle you will be told that you have already accepted the principle of the measure, and that it is not open to you to object on any Second Reading grounds. You will not be opposing reform if you delay the passage of this Bill, but you will stem the rising tide of rebellion in India and Burma, and you will be exercising your proper and legitimate function of imposing wise delay in ill-considered and precipitate legislation. You cannot salve your conscience by delegating your duties to a Committee nominated by the Secretary of State.

I have no personal acquaintance with Burma, and I do not pretend to know Burma, or the people of that country. But there are certain things which I do know, and which nobody can fail to know who has passed any of his life in India. I know that Burma is not India; that the Burmese are not Indians. They do not resemble any of the peoples of India any more than we ourselves do. They belong to the yellow race, and they resemble the Chinese far more than the peoples of India. Their language, religion, customs and system of Government, are all entirely different, and it must not be forgotten that they have been under British rule for a far less time than the people of India. On ordinary common sense principles I contend that it is not wise or usual to give to the youngest child of the family all that you are prepared to give to the eldest.

Do you think in spite of what the noble Earl has said, that the Burmese want this Bill? What reason have you for thinking so? Is there any one who can give me any reason for believing that the people of Burma want it? They do not want it. They cannot want it, seeing that it is utterly impossible that the people of Burma

should know anything about it. They know no more about the diarchy system of government which has been established in India than they do about the Einstein theory. When the noble Earl talked about the organs of public opinion he was making fun of this House. The organs of public opinion are not the same thing in India, or in any Eastern country, as they are in England. I urge, at any rate, that you should let the people of Burma see what the people of India make of this diarchy before you impose it upon them. Are you sure that the people of India are satisfied with the diarchy? There is everything to show that they are dissatisfied and are making it unworkable. And this is the moment that is to be chosen for imposing it on the totally different people of Burma. The noble Earl, with commendable frankness, has told us that the Government of India do not want the diarchy to be imposed on Burma, and he has also told us that that is the view of the Local Government. But your Lordships will surely insist on hearing the arguments on both sides.

If I may do so with all respect, I should like to remind your Lordships that the last exhortation which His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught gave at the conclusion of his magnificent and most impressive tour in India, was to the effect that we ought to listen more than we do to the wishes of India. Who is best able to tell you what are the wishes of India—the men on the spot, the men who have devoted their whole lives and all their energies, and all their abilities, to the care and the welfare of the peoples of India; or the Secretary of State, sitting here and surrounded by his clique of doctrinaire essayists, of half-fledged law students, and of avowed sedition-mongers? Those are the people who have urged the Secretary of State to bring this Bill before you. And are we to be bound by the personal pledges given by the Secretary of State? If so, where is the matter to end? The noble Earl seems to assume that if the Secretary of State, or presumably, any Minister gives a pledge, Parliament is bound to carry it out. That, again, is a new and arbitrary doctrine, from which I think it is well that Parliament should dissent at the earliest possible opportunity.

The situation in India, as my noble friend told you, is far more serious than anybody in this country realises. Lord Rawlinson, a soldier, warned the Council of India that there might be sporadic risings in the hot

Lord Amphill.

weather. Do your Lordships realise what sporadic risings mean? Risings all over the country, and therefore all the more difficult to contend with and to suppress. Is this the time to continue the process of deliberately disturbing the placid contentment of the peoples of India, which is the declared policy of the Secretary of State and the present Viceroy? Let us, at least, know what we are doing and why we are doing it, before we proceed any further. And the suggestion which I now make, with all respect, to your Lordships is that this debate should be adjourned until the correspondence between the Government of Burma and the Government of India, and between the Government of India and the Secretary of State, has been laid on the Table of this House. I beg to move that the debate be adjourned.

Moved, That the debate be now adjourned.—(*Lord Amphill.*)

THE EARL OF SELBORNE: My Lords, my excuse for intervening in this debate is not that I have any personal knowledge of Burma, but that I was, for the greater part of 1919 and for part of 1920, Chairman of a Joint Select Committee of the two Houses of Parliament which through many weeks considered the Government of India Act, as it now is, and this question of Burma came before us. We deliberately refrained from going into it exhaustively, but we took some evidence on it, and I, for one, received some very definite impressions, which I do not think I ought to withhold from your Lordships to-day. I agree with my noble friend who moved the Second Reading of this Bill that the question of self-government in Burma has got to be dealt with, and I am not going to take any side as between the Government of India and the India Office as to the particular form which that self-government should take in Burma. The Secretary of State may be quite right in thinking that the same form which has been applied to the Indian Provinces should be applied to Burma; or the Viceroy may be quite right in agreeing with the Lieutenant-Governor of Burma in thinking that the conditions of Burma require something different. I express no opinion as between those two authorities, and I agree with my noble friend opposite and His Majesty's Government, that that question might be very usefully thrashed out by a carefully and properly composed Joint Committee of the two Houses of Parliament.

But this Bill commits us to a principle to which allusion has been made by both my noble friends who have lately spoken and in respect to which, most strangely, my noble friend who introduced the Bill said nothing whatever, and that is the question whether Burma should remain a part of the Indian system. This Bill asks your Lordships to commit yourselves to the view that Burma should remain a part of the Indian system, and become, in fact, a Province of India, of the Indian Government, just as the Punjab, the United Provinces, Madras, and Bombay are. Now, that is an extraordinarily important matter. And yet my noble friend never said one single word about it, except to indicate that it was a matter very much in the mind of the Viceroy, who, he told us, had actually asked that his official title might be changed from that of Governor-General of India to that of Governor-General of India and Burma.

The impression that I received on that Select Committee of the two Houses of Parliament was quite definite. It was that Burma ought not to be part of the Indian system; that Burma ought to be taken out of the Indian system and made a separate Government; that there is, in fact, no more reason for making Burma a part of the Government of India than there is for making the Malay States, or East Africa, or Ceylon part of it. The conditions of Burma are, in the whole sphere of human interests, different from those of India—a different race, a different religion, a different language, different customs, and different conditions of life. Whatever my noble friend may say, he is asking you here and now, without any kind of information or argument, to commit yourselves to the proposition that Burma should become a part of the Government of India.

I think we are entitled to the information for which my noble friend Lord Ampthill has asked. I think we ought to see this correspondence between the Government of India and the India Office, and we ought to know why this tremendous question is pre-judged; and therefore, if my noble friend goes to a Division on the question of adjournment, I shall certainly vote with him. I could not have voted with my noble friend Lord Sydenham for the summary rejection of this Bill, because I know that the subject must be dealt with, and I do not wish for one moment to take sides as between different views on the

form which the government should take. But I do say that we have not the information or the arguments to commit this House to the proposition that Burma is for ever to be part of the Government of India.

LORD LAMINGTON: My Lords, in view of the speech just made by the Earl of Selborne would it not be possible to refer the consideration of this measure to the Joint Committee at this stage? They would have before them all the Papers, and when they reported this House would be in possession of the facts which have been elucidated, and the difficulties pointed out by Lord Ampthill would, to a great extent, be overcome. I do not know whether that is possible under the practice of the House.

THE EARL OF LYTTON: My Lords, I can answer in a moment the point put by Lord Lamington. It is not possible to refer a Bill to a Select Committee until it has been read a second time. If it were possible, of course, I should be glad to do so. I think I made it abundantly clear in my first speech that I have no desire whatever to commit your Lordships to the principle of this measure, but it is impossible to obtain detailed consideration of the Bill by a Select Committee until it has been read a second time.

Now I should like to deal with the point raised by Lord Selborne. He said that this Bill contained the important question of whether Burma should remain part of the Indian system. I think he implied that there was something in this Bill which was making Burma part of the Indian system, and he remarked that in moving the Second Reading I said nothing about it. I said nothing about it because there is nothing about it in the Bill. Burma is to-day part of British India. The interpretation of British India includes Burma, and there is nothing in this Bill which proposes to alter it. Had there been anything I should have said something about it. I told your Lordships that Burma was part of British India, and that there was a desire on the part of the Burmese, not for separation but for some indication in the Bill that Burma was a separate geographical entity; and the Government of India asked us to mark that fact by changing the title of the Governor-General. I told you that we had grave doubts whether that was the best way of doing what was required.

The question whether Burma should be separate from India is another question. I agree that there is a great deal to be said for it, and that there are a number of people in Burma who desire it, and the Select Committee may recommend it, but if my noble friend thinks that the separation of Burma from India is going to settle the whole question he is very much mistaken. It you do that you have still to deal with the Constitution of Burma. Now I think we have come to this point—that there is that much agreement amongst us. I do not think Lord Ampthill said anything about it, but every one else who has taken part in this debate has admitted that the Constitution of Burma is a matter which has to be dealt with, and Lord Sydenham also admitted that in Burma, as in India, our admitted goal was the establishment of self-government in that country. Therefore, the whole question is what is the best form of government to set up at this moment, having in view that ultimate goal. The Secretary of State and his Council have been giving earnest consideration to this matter for twelve months. They have come to two conclusions. One is that further delay is impossible—that further delay is contrary to the interests of order and government in Burma.

I am not going to follow Lord Sydenham into what I consider was his most unfair and most unjust attack upon the Secretary of State, when he said that his declared policy in India was that of throwing over our friends and strengthening the hands of our enemies. That, I think, was a most gratuitous and unfair criticism to make. I might just as well say of my noble friend Lord Sydenham that in the counsel which he has given to your Lordships this afternoon he was deliberately strengthening the hands of our enemies in Burma, because if there is one thing which would give satisfaction to the extreme political Party in Burma it would be the course which he has recommended you to adopt—namely, that of shelving the whole question. It would give them further justification for saying that no faith is to be placed in a British Minister, and that the Burmese will never get from a British Government what they have been promised.

Lord Ampthill referred to the pledge of the Secretary of State, and said it was a new doctrine, against which he protested, that a pledge given by a Minister had got to be honoured by Parliament. I never made any such claim. What I said was

The Earl of Lytton.

that a pledge given by a Secretary of State had got to be honoured by that Secretary of State, and it is because that pledge was given by him and he has come to the conclusion that the only way in which, on his responsibility, it can be fulfilled is by introducing legislation on these lines that this Bill has been introduced. It has been introduced on the responsibility of the Government, after careful consideration. I have told your Lordships that it would have been perfectly possible, Parliament having endowed the Secretary of State with power, to put that policy into force without coming to Parliament at all, and, if further delay is imposed, the Secretary of State would, in view of the situation in Burma at the present moment, put that policy into force.

What we desire is that in coming to a decision upon the matter we should have the judgment of Parliament passed upon the fullest investigation of the case. Here, again, I think we are really in agreement. All that is in dispute is whether the judgment of Parliament can best be delivered by adjourning this debate, by the publication of two or more Dispatches which have passed between the Government of India and the Secretary of State, and then resuming this debate, in which case I presume my noble friend would wish you to come to a final decision and vote for or against the Bill, and then the Bill would go through its normal stages and there would be no reference to a Committee at all.

LORD AMPTHILL: I did not say that.

THE EARL OF LYTTON: Perhaps I misunderstood my noble friend, but I thought he took exception to the procedure, where we suggested to your Lordships that the Bill should be submitted to the Joint Committee, on the ground that "this was"—I quote his words—"delegating the power of Parliament to a Committee." I understood him to object to that course, and to argue that Parliament itself in full session was the proper place to decide the matter. I therefore assume what he meant was that if the debate were adjourned Papers should be published, and then you should come to a decision. I submit with all deference that your Lordships would be better able to come to a decision when you have before you not only the Dispatches which we can publish now, but all the documents which may be

placed before the Joint Committee, with the evidence which may be given before that Committee, and the considered Report of the Committee itself.

If you adopt that course you are not giving anything away. You are not losing full opportunity of dealing with the matter when the Bill comes back. I do not want to deprive your Lordships of any discretion. As my noble friend behind me reminds me, all we are proposing to do is to give you an extra stage in the consideration of the Bill, in addition to all the stages which you have under the normal procedure of this House. When, finally, the matter comes before your Lordships, you will have, as I think you can have in no other way, all the knowledge of the relevant circumstances and the means of basing your decision upon full consideration. There is no question whatever here of depriving your Lordships of any stage for the consideration of the Bill.

We are agreed that the Constitution of Burma must be dealt with. We are agreed that Parliament should have full opportunity for considering what form that Constitution should take. The only difference between us, as I understand it, is that the course we have proposed is that the Bill should go to a Joint Committee to be threshed out by them and come back to your Lordships with their Report, while the course that Lord Amptill proposes is that the debate should be adjourned for an indefinite period and that Papers should be published which would be open to all your Lordships. I am quite willing, if your Lordships wish it, that Papers should be published which will enable you to form an opinion on the points at issue between the Government of India and the Secretary of State.

But I beg your Lordships not further to delay the sending of this Bill before the Joint Committee. The Committee will have the greater part of this session in which to carry out its labours. It may be that they will have to obtain evidence both from the Government of India and from the different sections of opinion in Burma. With full responsibility I say to your Lordships that it is not safe, it is not wise, further to delay action in this matter. Already two years have passed since the Government undertook to introduce for Burma a system of self-government analogous to that in India, and we are con-

vinced that the time has come in which we must show that we intend to fulfil the pledge that was given. I hope very much, therefore, that your Lordships will not accept the Motion for adjournment which has been moved.

THE EARL OF MIDLETON: My Lords, I am quite sure that the noble Earl wishes to be entirely fair in the weighty appeal that he has made to the House, and I hope he will not class me with those whom he thinks have some sinister motive in advocating the adjournment of this Bill. I think that I have an unblemished record in regard to all Indian legislation which has been before this House. I felt as much as any member of the House the manner in which the original scheme was started without this House having the slightest opportunity of criticising it. I felt also that the subsequent steps were taken in such a manner that Parliament could not possibly control them. None the less I agreed with my noble friends on this bench that we should do what we could to forward the matter. I cannot claim to have given to it the enormous amount of time which was given by my noble friend Lord Selborne as Chairman of the Committee which sat upon the subject, but I believe every member of the Committee sat through August and September, 1919, in order to expedite the scheme. I hope, therefore, that at all events I shall be absolved from any charge of a desire unnecessarily to delay Indian legislation.

Does the noble Earl quite realise the position in which he is putting the House this evening? He made a most interesting speech from which, for the first time, I at all events, and probably most of your Lordships, learned that there was a difference of opinion between the Secretary of State and the Indian Government upon this question. The noble Earl was unable to point to anything, with the exception of what was contained in his own speech, which would give guidance to the House such as would be obtained from Papers concerning the points of difference and as to the relative weight of the considerations put forward by the two parties. If, in these circumstances, the House is to give a Second Reading to the Bill and delegate the whole question to a Committee it will be very difficult to avoid the complaints which arose after the Committee of 1919 had reported. Members of the House who held the strongest opinions upon the

subject were able to show that they had never had an opportunity of expressing those opinions before the Committee was appointed, and, after the Committee had reported, there was the shortest possible amount of time available for discussion. They were urged to give their assent, and were made to feel that the whole question was already one which had been settled. I do not think that is a proper position for this House to occupy with regard to present or future Indian legislation.

My noble friend, in his concluding remarks, gave us a solemn warning against further delay. He said that during the winter of 1919 and the early summer of last year the whole of this question was fully investigated. If that be so, I think your Lordships have a right to complain that it is not until the month of March, 1921, that the results of those investigations, which were apparently far advanced or concluded a year ago, come before us for the first time. To put this measure on the Table on March 1, and to tell us that we must agree in principle to it on March 8, is really not reasonable, in the absence of all information except such as is included in the lucid speech of the noble Earl. His proposal is at variance with his language. He said that he wished your Lordships' judgment to be based on the fullest possible knowledge of the case. I have not the slightest doubt that the judgment arrived at will be that of the Committee and not of this House. Everybody knows—

THE EARL OF LYTTON: I beg the noble Earl's pardon. I am not withdrawing from this House any opportunity of exercising its judgment. I have told the noble Earl that the facts which will be laid before the Committee will be laid before this House. The House will have full knowledge when it comes to an ultimate decision. The matter is not decided by the Committee. It will come back from the Committee to this House, and your Lordships will exercise your judgment upon it.

THE EARL OF MIDLETON: And after the Committee has sat, how much stronger will be the case for urging that there should be no further delay on the part of this House! Unless there be great division of opinion in the Committee I cannot imagine a more difficult task than for any member of the House, who has a strong

The Earl of Middleton.

objection, to have to bring that objection to the notice of the House against the Report of the Committee. My mind is absolutely open on the subject, and I do not speak from my own point of view. How difficult will be the task of a member of this House in asking the Houses of Parliament to throw over a Joint Committee. I do not want any undue delay, but what I would ask the noble Earl to do is to assent to an adjournment of the debate this evening, and to lay these Papers upon the Table at as early a date as possible. I can assure the noble Earl that so far as we are concerned, after we have seen the Papers and had a reasonable time to consider them, we should be prepared to come to a decision. I am afraid that if my noble friend goes to a Division I must support him.

LORD SYDENHAM: May I ask the noble Earl if I heard him aright when I understood him to say that if the House accepted my Amendment and rejected this Bill the Secretary of State would go on carrying out his plan without the sanction of Parliament? If that is the case, of course I must withdraw my Amendment.

THE EARL OF LYTTON: I do not know whether I am really entitled to speak again as we are discussing Lord Ampthill's Motion for the adjournment of the debate. If I have the leave of your Lordships, however, I will explain shortly to Lord Sydenham what our position is with regard to his Amendment. If his Amendment were carried, we should be placed in this position. Your Lordships would have rejected the principle of this Bill, but you would not have given us any instructions, or any indication of your opinion, as to the alternative course. You would not have directed us to follow the proposals of the Government of India. You would have left us in the position of having either to do nothing at all, or else to proceed with our own policy. Faced with such a situation as that the Government would have no hesitation. I have told your Lordships that delay, in our opinion, would not be possible. Not having received, and not having had an opportunity of receiving, from Parliament any direction as to any other policy, the Secretary of State would have no alternative but to go on with his policy in the ordinary way under the Government of India Act.

INDIAN AFFAIRS.

LORD AMPHILL rose to ask His Majesty's Government whether, in view of the fact that the Preamble of the Government of India Act contains the words "Whereas the time and manner of each advance (towards responsible Government) can be determined only by Parliament upon whom the responsibility lies for the welfare and advancement of the Indian peoples," the House is justified in assuming that any act of any official which affects the "welfare" of any section of the people of India must be a legitimate subject of inquiry in Parliament.

The noble Lord said : My Lords, I think that the circumstances which have impelled me to put down the two Questions which appear on the Notice Paper are sufficiently well known to render it unnecessary that I should trouble your Lordships with any long explanation. What happened was this. News filtered through from India—in spite of the fact that we are hearing very little about the present state of affairs in India—to the effect that an individual named Harkishen Lal, who had been convicted for a criminal conspiracy against the Government and had been sentenced to transportation for life and the forfeiture of his property, had been appointed by the Government of the Punjab as one of the Ministers under this new system of government. As a person convicted of a criminal offence he was ineligible for election to the Council. It is only possible to assume, therefore, that he has been pardoned for the purpose of being elected to the Council, and thereafter appointed as Minister.

When this news filtered through a member of the House of Commons asked whether the facts were as stated in a certain newspaper, and if so whether Harkishen Lal had certain powers and responsibilities under the Government of India Act. There was an extraordinary ruling from the Chair of the House of Commons. The Speaker intervened hastily to protect the Secretary of State from this very inconvenient interrogation. He said that as India had got Home Rule, the less we interfered with the Provincial Councils the better. The Speaker was corrected immediately by several members of the House in his use of the phrase "Home Rule" and amended it to "Government in the nature of Home Rule." This was a very startling ruling to all those persons

who were watching the affairs of India, and to many, both inside and outside the House, it seemed a very daring invasion of the liberties and responsibilities of member of both Houses of Parliament.

We are therefore anxious to know exactly how we stand in this matter, and whether the discussion of Indian affairs and the right of interpellation on Indian affairs, which has hitherto been enjoyed by Parliament, still exists. I would ask your Lordships whether an inquiry as to whether the Governor of the Province, a British official appointed by the Crown, had or had not appointed a certain person to be his Minister, and a discussion of facts as stated in a certain newspaper could, by any strain of language, be interpreted as an interference with an act of the Provincial Government which had nothing to do with the appointment of Harkishen Lal. That was the question which was discussed in the House of Commons and it is particularly important in these days of startling innovations and of surprising invasions of our personal liberties.

LORD SYDENHAM : My Lords, I agree with the noble Earl, who said the other day that subjects which are proper for discussion in the Legislative Council for India should not be previously debated in Parliament. Quite a different matter is the discussion of anything affecting the welfare of any section of the Indian people and of our own countrymen in India. This is one of the results of the diarchical system, and I confess that I dislike intensely such a method of Government. But, in considering this question, we must remember that certain subjects must be open to discussion so long as we retain responsibility for India. With regard to the case of Harkishen Lal permanent officials in the Punjab must have assisted in preparing the case against him. He is now set over them with very large powers. He controls the whole, or a large part, of the work of many British and Indian officials in the Punjab. Whoever is responsible has surely made a terrible mistake, which must have very serious consequences in India. If Parliament cannot discuss a decision which must have been made by some British official in India, how can it be possible for it to discharge its duties and responsibilities to the people of India ? And these responsibilities are imposed upon it by the Preamble of the Government of India Bill.

THE EARL OF LYTTON: My Lords, I am very glad of the opportunity afforded me by my noble friend's question to deal with a matter which, as he says, has aroused a good deal of discussion in the Press and elsewhere, and which I cannot help thinking is still the subject of some misunderstanding. The Government certainly had no intention whatever of disputing the legal right of Parliament to discuss any matters affecting the welfare of any of His Majesty's subjects in India, and neither the ruling of Mr. Speaker in the House of Commons nor the remarks I made in your Lordships' House last week, in reply to a question from my noble friend, Lord Tenterden, are to be considered as an attempt either to invade the responsibility of the Secretary of State, or to deprive Parliament of any means of exercising its legal right of discussing Indian affairs.

As I said the other day, it is, I think, well that both Houses of Parliament should understand the effect of the Government of India Act which they have recently passed; and it is no less important that this matter should be understood in India and that any ground of fear or misapprehension there should be removed. I will endeavour to put before your Lordships, in answer to my noble friend, a statement with which I believe that he and, I hope, all your Lordships, will agree. Your Lordships know that the functions of the Government of India have now been divided as between central and provincial on the one hand and as between reserve and transferred on the other hand. Now, with regard to central subjects directly administered by the Government of India, and also as regards reserved subjects in the Provinces, the legal position remains exactly what it always has been, the Secretary of State being theoretically responsible to Parliament for every act within those spheres of every Government in India—a responsibility which in general, of course, has to be translated into practice by allowing the Governor-General in Council and the Provincial Governors in Council discretion to administer their charges subject to the authority only of the Secretary of State.

I do not think my noble friend will quarrel with this statement of the position. But though this remains the legal position, the Act has created, both in the Central Government and in the Provinces, much larger and more representative Legislatures than existed before, all of which have substantial elected majorities and are

conducted on the assumption that the new Provincial Governor will be given as free a hand as possible in shaping Provincial policy, and in dealing with Provincial affairs generally. Account must be taken of these two facts which are new factors in the situation. The Secretary of State is disposed to act on the advice of the Joint Select Committee, who stated in their Report that—

“he might reasonably consider that only in exceptional circumstances should he be called upon to intervene in matters of purely Indian interest where the Government of India and the Indian Legislature are in agreement.”

And similarly—I am again quoting the Report—

“in purely provincial matters, which are reserved, when the Provincial Government and the Legislature are in agreement their views should ordinarily be allowed to prevail.”

Subject to those considerations so far as reserved provincial subjects and central subjects are concerned, the legal position is exactly what it always has been.

But in respect of transferred provincial subjects it is obvious that there must be a substantial change, and the real question raised by the noble Lord is what exactly is the nature and extent of the change which has been brought about by transferring certain functions of government to Indian Ministers responsible to elected Legislatures. In the first place the transferred subjects are now administered by Ministers who are directly responsible to the Legislatures which vote their salaries. They are also responsible to the Governor who appoints them, and by whom they may be dismissed. If they do not satisfy the majority of the Legislature they may be forced to resign by the withholding of their salaries. If they do not satisfy the Governor they may be dismissed, and, in the last resort, of course, if the Legislature in either supporting, or failing to support, the Ministers, does not satisfy the electorate, then the electorate may change the Legislature. Therefore, the responsibility for the administration of transferred subjects is shared by the Governor, the Ministers, and the Legislative Councils.

Since the administration of transferred subjects may, in certain circumstances, affect the interests of reserved subjects—the policy of Ministers, for instance, with the consent of their Legislative Council, might lead to civil disturbances or breaches of the law necessitating the intervention of the police or military authorities—and

since, in the event of dispute between a Governor and his Legislative Council the action of the Governor might become the subject of discussion in Parliament, it is impossible to deny that Parliament has also an ultimate responsibility for the administration of transferred subjects, and it might even be contended that Parliament has some responsibility for the actual selection of Ministers, though I think reflection would show that this last connection would be untenable in practice.

Lastly, it is certainly true, as pointed out by the noble Lord in his Question, that since Parliament has to decide the time and manner of each successive advance towards responsible government, and as each advance must depend on the success or otherwise of the last stage, Parliament must have the means of informing itself as to the working of the self-governing machinery, and as to whether each stage has been a success or failure. I intend by that to convey the fact that Parliament has the responsibility which it always had with regard to reserved and central subjects, and that it undoubtedly has the ultimate responsibility with regard to transferred subjects. At the same time it must be perfectly clear that government in India, under the new system, would be absolutely impossible if Parliament, by virtue of its ultimate responsibility for the welfare of India, were to interfere in the administration of subjects which it has transferred to Local Governments as represented by the Governor and his Ministers, and if it were to seek to make Indian Ministers responsible to itself in detail as well as to their Governors and their own Councils.

That really is the point which I tried to bring out the other day in answering Lord Tenterden's Question, and it is for this reason, as I explained then, that the Secretary of State in Council, on the advice of one of Lord Southborough's Committees and of the Joint Select Committee, limited by Statutory Rule the exercise of his powers of superintendence, direction and control, in relation to transferred subjects to cases where central subjects or Imperial interests are affected. It is in that spirit we appeal to Parliament to exercise an equal self-restraint in the use of its rights of interrogation and criticism. That is really the burden of our case. Parliament has undoubtedly the ultimate responsibility, but it must exercise some self-restraint in the exercise of that

responsibility. The thorough investigation of the working of the new Act by periodical Statutory Commissions has been provided for in the Act itself, but Parliament must be content to limit its legal right of pulling up the young plants to see how they are growing.

BRITISH OFFICIALS IN INDIA.

LORD AMPHILL: My Lords, I wish now to ask His Majesty's Government whether, in view of the fact that almost every British official in India will now be controlled, as regards the whole or a portion of his functions, by an Indian Minister, who is appointed and may be dismissed by the Governor who is appointed by the Crown, the case of any such official who feels himself aggrieved by the action of a Minister can be brought to the notice of Parliament.

My first Question was on general lines, but this one brings forward a particular case which will test the answer just given by the noble Earl. To abstain altogether from inquiry in regard to transferred subjects is impossible, seeing that British officials in India, in all branches of the public service, will at one time or another be under the control of Indian Ministers. So long as there is the present connection between the United Kingdom and India there will presumably be our public servants—the Navy and Army, the Indian Civil Service, and all the branches of the Provincial Services. In these Services there are numerous numbers of officials who will, of course, be controlled by Indian Ministers. If we are not to touch transferred subjects at all, it will mean that we could not inquire into the facts of any alleged grievance. What I want to have positively from the noble Earl is whether, in cases of the grievance of officials due to the act of an Indian Minister in charge of his Department and responsible to his Council, it could be taken as an interference with the action of the Council that such a case was brought to the notice of Parliament.

The injunction we have received from the India Office, that Parliament should not interfere with the details of Indian administration, was utterly uncalled for. There never has been such interference in Parliament. On the contrary, the complaint of all people in India who are anxious that the supreme responsibility of the British race should be respected and under

stood, has always been that Parliament has neglected Indian affairs in both Houses. When there has been any kind of Indian debate there has always been a poor attendance, so that the suggestion that Parliament was likely to interfere in the details of Provincial administration seems to me to be utterly unnecessary. I am sure your Lordships will agree with me that the Secretary of State in particular, and His Majesty's Government in general, need have no apprehensions on that score. But what we would like to know is whether any British subject, be he an Englishman or an Indian, who has got a grievance against the Administration in India, will have the right to bring his grievance to the notice of Parliament, and whether members of Parliament will have the right to ask for information on the subject.

THE EARL OF LYTTON: My Lords, I do not accept as an accurate statement of fact the opening words of the noble Lord's Question. It is not true that almost every British official in India will now be controlled as regards a whole or portion of his functions by an Indian Minister, although, of course, it is true that a very large number of British officials are included in the Services which, either directly or indirectly, will be administered by Indian Ministers.

But that, of course, is a very small point. What I understand my noble friend wants to know is what is the right of appeal which officials may have if they feel aggrieved. On that point very careful provision has been made in the Government of India Act itself. In the first place, under paragraph 7 (4) of his Instructions the Governor is personally charged with the duty of safeguarding all members of all Services in the legitimate exercise of their functions and in the enjoyment of all recognised rights and privileges. Secondly, under Rule 10 of the Devolution Rules no order for the posting of an officer of an All-India Service and (in the case of members of All-India and Provincial Services) no order affecting the emoluments or pensions of any officer, no order of formal censure, and no order on a memorial shall be passed without the personal concurrence of the Governor. Finally, every official, whether British or Indian, who is appointed by the Secretary of State in Council, has a right conferred by the Act itself of access to the Governor for redress of grievances arising out of orders of an official superior, and he cannot be dismissed except by the

Lord Amythill.

Secretary of State in Council, if he was appointed by that authority.

Therefore, in the future as in the past, any official who considers himself unjustly treated has a right of appeal to a higher authority. First of all, he has a right of appeal to the Governor; then (in the case of officials appointed by an authority higher than the Local Government) a right of appeal to the Governor-General, and, finally, to the Secretary of State. It has always been recognised that until an official has exhausted his rights of appeal Parliamentary discussion of his case would be inopportune. The right of Parliament to discuss the case of an official who has exhausted his right of appeal is, of course, unquestionable, but that right has always been tempered, in the case of overseas countries in which Parliament has delegated authority to local Executives responsible to local Legislatures, by recognition of the general inconvenience of discussing in the Imperial Parliament matters arising out of the action of the local Administration.

In the case of India this consideration affects primarily the transferred side of the Administration—as I explained in answer to the previous Question—and even on that side should not prevent discussion of any case that appears to involve glaring injustice. But I would submit to your Lordships that, even in the reserved sphere, the interests of discipline and good administration will best be served by confidence in the discretion of those who are called upon to undertake the high responsibilities of Governor of a Province in the matter of the treatment of their subordinates.

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Moved, That the following Lords be appointed to serve on the Standing Joint Committee on Indian Affairs, and that the Committee have power to agree with the Commons upon the appointment of a Chairman—

E. Midleton,
E. Buxton,
V. Hutchinson, (*E. Donoughmore*)
L. Harris,
L. Chelmsford,
L. Lamington,
L. Islington,
L. Carmichael,
L. Sydenham,
L. Clywd,
L. Meston.

—(*Lord Hylton.*)

LORD AMPTHILL: My Lords, before the Question is put I should like to ask how this Committee was nominated. Was it done in the ordinary way by consultation between the Whips, or in what way? I do not think that all members of the House will be satisfied with the composition of it. I would point out one little flaw. You have three ex-Governors of Bombay and none of Madras. Madras is an important Province, and there are questions in Madras which are peculiar to that part of India, as your Lordships will remember from the discussions on the Government of India Act. Another little oversight seems to be the inclusion of Lord Chelmsford, who is not in this country. As I understand, the Committee is to get to work at once, and surely it is better to appoint someone who is available, and on the spot. I am not suggesting any Amendment, but am merely asking for information as to how this Committee was nominated.

THE EARL OF LYTTON: My Lords, I am very sorry if my noble friend is not satisfied with the *personnel* of the Committee. I can assure him that a great deal of trouble has been taken to obtain a Committee which, in our opinion, was thoroughly representative of authoritative Indian opinion in this country. The *personnel* has been made the subject of discussion between the Leader of the House and the noble Marquess who leads the Opposition. It was obvious that the first person we should have invited to join the Committee was the noble Marquess (Lord Crewe), himself an ex-Secretary of State, and it was only because he was unwilling, I am sorry to say, to become a member that his name does not appear.

With regard to Lord Chelmsford, again we were in doubt as to what we should do. I think your Lordships will all agree that it is clearly desirable that Lord Chelmsford, who is shortly to return to this country, and who will represent the latest experience of Indian matters, should, if willing to serve, be a member of the Committee, and if we filled up the whole eleven places it would be impossible, if he returned, to find a place for him on the Committee. Therefore we thought that in the best interest of the matter we should ask him if he would be willing to serve. Of course, we have consulted him, and he has agreed to serve, and consequently we have put his name on the Committee.

(D 1441—I.)

LORD AMPTHILL: What about the three ex-Governors of Bombay? Is not that an excessive representation?

On Question, Motion agreed to.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

[From Minutes of March 8, 1921.]

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Message sent to the House of Commons acquainting them of the appointment of eleven Lords to serve on this Committee, and requesting them to appoint eleven Members of that House to be joined to the said Committee.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Wednesday, 9th March, 1921.

LORD RAWLINSON'S SPEECH IN INDIA.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (THE EARL OF LYTTON): My Lords, I wish to ask your Lordships' permission to make a personal statement arising out of the debate on the Second Reading of the Government of Burma Bill yesterday afternoon. Your Lordships will remember that in the course of the debate my noble friend on the cross benches, Lord Sydenham, referred to a statement which had appeared in the newspapers in which the Commander-in-Chief in India, Lord Rawlinson, was reported as having stated in the Council of State that "the Government would be extremely lucky if the country escaped sporadic disorders in the next month," and that he "strongly objected to certain proposals of Sir William Vincent." To this statement I think these words were added in *The Times* version, that "owing to the attacks made upon them officers were already showing signs of losing their initiative."

I was not able last evening to say anything in reply, but as soon as the statement appeared the Secretary of State telegraphed to India asking for the facts. He has now received a reply, the substance of which will be communicated to the House of Commons this afternoon. In view of the reference to the telegram in the debate here yesterday afternoon I think it is due to my noble friend, and to the House, that I should explain that there was no founda-

D

tion whatever for the statement which appeared in the newspapers. We have been informed, in reply, that there is no truth in any of the allegations; that none of the subjects referred to were even mentioned in the Commander-in-Chief's speech, and that the Commander-in-Chief asks that a categorical denial should be made. Sir William Vincent, in a speech in the course of the debate reported, alluded to possible sporadic disorders and to the possible effect on officers of such proposals as those put forward by Mr. Sastri, the mover of the resolution under discussion. The Press report is correct, that six out of the eight proposals made by Mr. Sastri were rejected by the Council, and, presumably, the two that were accepted were not regarded by the Government of India as unreasonable.

Then I would add that we have protested to *Reuter*, on whom we rely so much for news from India and who are generally accurate, and they have expressed to the Secretary of State their regrets for the unfortunate mistakes connected with this telegram. In view of the arguments which the noble Lord, Lord Sydenham, founded upon that telegram, I thought it was due to him that I should tell him at the earliest possible moment that the telegram was inaccurate.

LORD SYDENHAM: My Lords, I hope I shall be in order in expressing my deep regret to the House, and my apologies to the noble Earl, for quoting what appears to have been an entirely inaccurate telegram. The words in the telegram were explicit and were said to have been sent by *Reuter* from Delhi, and that must be my excuse. I hope, however, that the India Office will see that telegrams so inaccurate are not sent to this country in the future.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 14th March, 1921.

THE ARMY IN INDIA.

LORD LAMINGTON: My Lords, I beg to ask His Majesty's Government what number of Commissions in the Indian Army in their respective classifications have been given to Indians; and to move for Papers.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (THE EARL OF LYTTON): My Lords, in 1917, when the Cabinet

The Earl of Lytton.

decided that Indians were to be eligible for the King's Commission, nine officers of the Native Indian Land Forces were at once granted Commissions, seven as captains, two as lieutenants, and posted to Indian regiments. The officers selected bore a distinguished record in the war. In 1918 arrangements were made for the admission of Indian cadets to the Royal Military College at Sandhurst, ten to be nominated each year, or five each half-year. The first five joined the College in January, 1919, and of that number two have since received Commissions in the Unattached List for the Indian Army, two have unfortunately died, and one has been withdrawn. There are now seventeen Indian cadets in training at Sandhurst. It was also arranged in 1918 that a maximum of twenty permanent Commissions in the Indian Army should be given to Indian officers who distinguished themselves during the war. Fourteen Commissions have been granted in this category—or rather fifteen have been granted, fourteen to Indian Officers, and in another case an Indian gentleman who rendered valuable service during the war was also granted a Commission and admitted as a captain into the Indian Army.

LORD LAMINGTON: Twenty was the maximum?

THE EARL OF LYTTON: Yes, it was proposed to create twenty, of which number fifteen have been granted. In addition, thirty-nine graduates from the Training School established at Indore in 1918 for the purpose of training selected Indians for temporary Commissions, have been granted Commissions on probation, and such of those thirty-nine as are recommended after their probationary period of one year will be gazetted permanently to the Indian Army. In addition to the above Commissions granted in the Indian Army and Unattached List for the Indian Army, a considerable number of honorary Commissions in the Army have been granted to Indian officers and others. If I may sum up; there were nine Commissions granted in 1917. Of the Indian cadets at Sandhurst, two have now received Commissions and seventeen are in training at Sandhurst. Of the permanent Commissions which it was proposed to give to officers in the Indian Army, fifteen have received Commissions, and thirty-nine officers from the training school at Indore

are nearing the completion of their probationary period. When that probationary period is completed they will, if recommended, receive Commissions.

LORD LAMINGTON: I am obliged to the noble Earl for his answer. Could he give me some information about the Training School at Indore? It is the first I have heard of it. Has it been formed solely for the purpose of training these Indians for the Army, or has it any larger scope?

THE EARL OF LYTTON: I am afraid I am not in a position to give the noble Lord that information, but I will make inquiries about it.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

[From Minutes of March 14, 1921.]

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Message from the Commons to acquaint this House that they have appointed a Committee of eleven Members to join with the Committee appointed by this House, as mentioned in their Lordships' Message of March 8, as a Standing Joint Committee on Indian Affairs: Then a Message ordered to be sent to the House of Commons to propose that the Standing Joint Committee do meet in Committee Room A on Thursday next, at eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

[From Minutes of March 21, 1921.]

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Message from the Commons that they have ordered that the Select Committee appointed by them to join with the Select Committee of this House on Indian Affairs do meet the Committee appointed by their Lordships in Committee Room A on Thursday, the 17th instant, at eleven o'clock, as proposed by this House.

(D 1441—I.)

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Wednesday, 23rd March, 1921.

RUSSIA AND AFGHANISTAN.

LORD SYDENHAM: My Lords, I rise to ask His Majesty's Government whether there is any truth in the statement which has appeared in the Press that a Treaty has been concluded between the Soviet authorities at Moscow and Afghanistan, and, if so, whether the terms are known. Last year there were rumours of the negotiation of a Peace between the Afghans and the Bolsheviks, but, lately, circumstantial accounts have been published in the Press stating that such a Treaty had been signed, and that it was signed on February 28 last.

Early in January, our Mission, under Sir Henry Dobbs, arrived at Kabul, and has been there ever since. In October, 1919, when I raised the question of the Peace arrangements with Afghanistan, which seemed to me then to be, and which I still think are, very unsatisfactory, the noble Earl the Leader of the House said that "only the first stage of those proceedings had so far been enacted, and that we were in the intervening period of six months in which we were waiting to see how the Amir would conduct himself." But, in place of those six months, the intervening period has stretched out to very nearly a year and a half, and the protracted course of these negotiations must naturally be a source of anxiety to all of us who are trying to follow the drift of events in Afghanistan and India.

As long ago as May 23, 1919, the Viceroy reported to the Secretary of State that the Amir has sent a "subservient" message to "the honoured President of the Russian Republic," and the Afghan invasion across the Indian frontier, which was planned, as we all know, to coincide with the rebellion in the Punjab, may very probably have received some encouragement from the Bolsheviks. Since then, there have been rumours of Bolshevik Missions at Kabul, where we know that some Indian conspirators have been residing for several years. If there is now a Treaty in existence it must have been concluded during the presence of our Mission in Kabul, and also during the negotiations for a trade agreement with the Bolsheviks in London. If it were so, I should think that the Trade Agreement must have been violated by the Bolsheviks, and such an event really

would constitute a very ominous political conjunction.

In 1878 we went to war with Afghanistan because the Amir at that time was receiving a Russian Mission. *Tempora mutantur, nos et mutamur in illis*. But surely the conclusion of an Afghan Treaty with the Bolsheviks, who are a more dangerous power from the point of view of India than the Russia of the Czars ever was in my opinion, would be far more serious than the offence of Shere Ali, the Amir of those days. I hope the noble Earl will be able to say that there is no truth whatever in this story. If it is true, I must say that the proposed reduction of the Indian Army at this moment would be an act of simple madness.

THE EARL OF LYTTON: My Lords, I am afraid I am unable to give my noble friend the assurance for which he hopes, and I cannot answer his Question from any sources more authoritative than those which are open to himself. On March 3 a wireless message was issued from Moscow stating specifically that a Treaty had been signed between the Bolshevik Government and the Amir of Afghanistan, and that this Treaty had been signed on February 28. I must conclude, therefore, that that statement is based upon fact, and that a Treaty has actually been signed.

We have no official information as to the terms of that Treaty, but my noble friend has reminded your Lordships that an article appeared in the *Manchester Guardian* of March 18 from the correspondent of that paper at Reval which purported to give a summary of the terms of that Treaty. And if my noble friend has seen the note which we delivered to M. Krassin, on March 16, he will have observed that we have for a long time suspected that the Bolshevik Government were carrying on negotiations with Afghanistan, which were aimed at our interests in India and which we regarded as hostile to our Government. Whether, as seems to be suggested by the article in the *Manchester Guardian*, those negotiations have actually found part in the Treaty itself I am unable to tell him, because, until the terms of the Treaty are revealed by one or other of the contracting parties, we have no means of knowing what it contains.

Of course, it is the business of His Majesty's Government to find out as soon as possible, now that we are informed that

Lord Sydenham.

a Treaty has been signed, what the terms of that Treaty are. It is doubtful, I think, that we shall get much information on the subject from the Bolshevik Government, but as my noble friend has reminded your Lordships, we are carrying on negotiations at this moment with the Afghan Government, and in the course of those negotiations we shall certainly require that this Treaty shall be revealed in its entirety, and when His Majesty's Government are acquainted with the terms of the Treaty it will be for them to see whether it is consistent with the Trade Agreement which we have entered into with the Russian Government and with the friendly relations we desire to establish with the Amir of Afghanistan.

THE MARQUESS OF CREWE: My Lords, as the noble Earl has alluded to the Trade Agreement which has lately been entered into between His Majesty's Government and the Soviet Government in Russia, may I ask what he conceives to be the bearing of that Agreement on the Question of my noble friend? As I understand, the Trade Agreement involves a promise on the part of the *de facto* Government in Russia not to enter into any arrangements or intrigues eastwards which are detrimental to us. That being so, one would have supposed that it would be necessary for them, if the Agreement is to be put into operation, to state precisely the terms of the Treaty with Afghanistan, supposing any such Treaty to exist. I cannot but think it would have been within the power of His Majesty's Government to have made a revelation of the relations existing between Soviet Russia and Afghanistan a positive condition of the Trade Agreement into which they have entered.

LORD EMMOTT: My Lords, perhaps some light may be thrown on the question raised by the noble Marquess by the fact that the Foreign Office did not conclude this Agreement. I do not know whether it is a method of procedure which will be found very desirable when dealing with our foreign relations. I should have thought that this Treaty with Afghanistan was an acid test of what is meant by the Soviet Government in entering into a Trade Agreement with us, and that it should have been a condition precedent to that Agreement that we should know exactly the terms of the Treaty which the Soviet Government has concluded with Afghanistan.

LORD STUART OF WORTLEY: My Lords, it is within the recollection of many of us that many years ago it was settled that Afghanistan, although said to be an independent State, was to be considered within the sphere of British influence, by the Agreement signed between ourselves and the late Czarist Government in Russia. It occurs to me that it is highly probable that one element in this reported arrangement between the *de facto* Government in Russia and Afghanistan may be that the *de facto* Government in Russia has promised a subsidy to the Amir of Afghanistan, which would give him the closest possible interest in observing and following the policy of the Soviet Government. It seems to me extraordinary if, in negotiating this Trade Agreement, we have not insisted, before the Agreement should come into force, that all such measures should be reversed and abandoned as part of their policy by the Soviet Government, before they can hope to enter into full relations with ourselves.

LORD SYDENHAM: Will the noble Earl say whether it will be an instruction to Sir Henry Dobbs not to conclude any arrangement with Afghanistan until the terms of the Treaty with the Bolsheviks have been revealed?

THE EARL OF LYTTON: My Lords, I am sure the noble Marquess will understand my reluctance to be drawn into the discussion, without notice, of a matter which concerns primarily the Foreign Office. I can say, however, that I agree with Lord Emmott that this Treaty with Afghanistan must be accepted as an acid test of the willingness of the Soviet Government to carry out the conditions we have laid down in the Trade Agreement we have entered into with them. In my answer to Lord Sydenham I did not wish to imply that it was not possible for His Majesty's Government to obtain a revelation of this Treaty, or, indeed, to make a revelation of that Treaty a condition of the signing of the Trade Agreement with the Russian Government. Obviously, that is quite within the competence of His Majesty's Government. Speaking for the India Office, I preferred to deal with the other Party to this Treaty, and to tell my noble friend that we had means at our disposal for ensuring a revelation of the Treaty. He now asks me whether an instruction will be sent to Sir Henry

Dobbs not to conclude any negotiations with Afghanistan until that Treaty has been revealed. I cannot, of course, without further notice, give him any assurance on that matter, but I can tell him that it is certainly not the intention of His Majesty's Government to enter into any Treaty with Afghanistan until we know, in their entirety, the terms of their Treaty with the Russian Government.

NAGPUR RIOT.

LORD SYDENHAM: My Lords, in accordance with Notice I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether a riot occurred at Nagpur on February 23 in which a mob of 5,000 men took part; whether the Deputy Commissioner and the civil surgeon were wounded, and much looting took place; and whether any account of the facts of this outbreak can be given for the information of the House.

The disturbances referred to are symptomatic of what is happening, I am afraid, in many parts of India, and we do not hear of all that is happening now in that country. My information is that the riots at Nagpur were very serious, though I believe that no loss of life actually occurred. The mob is said to have taken possession for a time of the Deputy-Commissioner's *kacheri*, and all the Europeans in the station had to be herded into the armoury and kept under arms all night. That is a serious matter in a country like India, because it shows a dangerous weakening of the authority of Government, and it means that the lives of Europeans are no longer as safe as they used to be. In this case I understand 200 British infantry with machine-guns arrived in the evening; otherwise, the position of those Europeans, isolated in the armoury, might have become most precarious. I suggest to the noble Earl that it might be well if the India Office would issue a weekly bulletin of events that are happening in India, in order that the public might feel that it was in possession of full information about these sporadic outbreaks.

THE EARL OF LYTTON: My Lords, the facts referred to in my noble friend's Question are substantially as stated, and I will read him an account of the occurrence which has been compiled upon telegraph information which we have received from India. The disturbances referred to arose out of the arrest of a prominent local

resident on a charge of sedition. A large meeting of protest was held, and on February 23 there was a general abstention from work, which did not extend to the mills. On the next day the auction sales of liquor shops for the district were to be held at the District Court. A large crowd assembled to prevent the sale, and assaulted one of the contractors. The police pressed the mob back to the city, where it dispersed. Two European officers and seven policemen were injured by stones thrown at them, but, fortunately, not seriously in any case. In the city the mob again collected and looted several liquor shops, the police force being inadequate to control them. The same night another mass meeting was held with no serious consequences. A small force of troops was called in from the cantonment at Kamptee.

On the morning of the 25th everything was quiet and everybody at work. The District Magistrate, in the exercise of his ordinary powers, prohibited public meetings for one month. Notwithstanding this, an attempt was made to hold one, but the crowd dispersed quietly on learning that the meeting was prohibited. The sales, however, could not take place, because the contractors were afraid to attend. The District Magistrate had an interview with the leaders of the Non-Cooperation Movement, and warned them that the Order prohibiting meetings would be enforced, and that peace and order would be maintained by all the means at his disposal. The leaders undertook to use their influence to keep things quiet, but would give no guarantee.

The Magistrate also prohibited persons entering the civil lines from the city without good reasons, fearing another demonstration at the Courts during the hearing of a case in which a doctor was showing cause against an Order prohibiting the picketing of liquor shops. That Order has since been confirmed and made absolute for two months. The Governor of the Central Provinces sent a message to the Council regarding the disturbances, repudiating false statements about Government policy, and stating that the Government would use all lawful and reasonable means to enforce authority by taking legal action against offenders. He invited the support of all responsible persons against the movement directed towards subverting the authority of the Government.

That, summarised shortly, is the story of this occurrence. The latest information

The Earl of Lytton.

we have received, dated March 17, is that there has been no further trouble in Nagpur. I hope my noble friend, when he studies the account which I have given, will feel that, although the riot was certainly a serious one, it was not quite so serious as he at first supposed. Nor was it, I think, at all symptomatic of any tendency throughout India as a whole of a weakening on the part of the Executive Government, or of any inability on their part to maintain order. There were local circumstances which accounted for the riot in this case.

My noble friend concluded by asking that, if possible, some steps should be taken to issue weekly information to the Press regarding the situation in India. I am happy to be able to tell my noble friend that the matter has occupied the attention of the Secretary of State for some time, and that recently he has asked me personally to organise in the Department machinery for supplying information to the Press, regularly and daily, upon current matters in India, and I hope, as soon as that organisation is complete, that my noble friend will have no cause to complain of any absence of information upon Indian matters. If there is any cause of complaint it will be due not to failure on the part of the India Office to supply information, but to reluctance on the part of the newspapers to publish it for their readers.

LORD SYDENHAM: I beg to thank the noble Earl for his reply. I am certain that the new organisation which he will control will be a success, and will provide what is a great public need at the present moment.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Wednesday, 20th April, 1921.

GOVERNMENT OF BURMA BILL. [H.L.]

LORD ISLINGTON: My Lords, I beg to ask my noble friend the Under-Secretary for India a Question of which I have given him private notice—namely, whether he can tell the House what course the Government propose to take regarding the Government of Burma Bill.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (THE EARL OF LYTTON): My Lords, you will remember that when the debate on the Second Reading of the

Government of Burma Bill was proceeding, I explained that while there was unanimity between the Government of Burma, the Government of India and ourselves, as to the necessity and urgency for providing a new Constitution for Burma, there was, unfortunately, a difference of opinion between us as to the precise form that Constitution should take, and with a view to ascertaining the opinion of Parliament on that question I explained that it was the intention of the Government, if the Bill received a Second Reading, to refer it to the Standing Joint Committee of both Houses of Parliament on Indian Affairs. Your Lordships will also remember that in consequence of arguments used in the course of that debate, further discussion was adjourned until such time as the correspondence which had passed between the Government of India and ourselves on this subject had been published. That correspondence has now been published in a White Paper, and as I think sufficient time has elapsed for your Lordships to have made yourselves familiar with this document, I should normally have put down for an early date the resumption of the adjourned debate on the Second Reading of the Bill.

I have had, however, some communications from certain members of your Lordships' House suggesting that, although there is, I think, a unanimous wish on the part of the House that the whole matter of the Constitution of Burma should be referred to a Select Committee, there is some anxiety lest, if this Bill is given a Second Reading, the discretion both of the Joint Committee and of the House hereafter, may be prejudiced to some extent. Our object in introducing the Bill was to provide an opportunity of stating the policy of His Majesty's Government and of ensuring that that policy should receive consideration at the hands of the Joint Committee. That purpose has already been served by the introduction of the Bill, by the debate which took place on the Second Reading, and by the publication of the Papers containing the correspondence between the Government of India and ourselves. It never was our intention to commit this House, even in principle, to the policy of our Bill, until such time as they had before them the Report of the Standing Joint Committee.

In deference, therefore, to the opinions which have been expressed to me the

Government is prepared to leave the whole question in the hands of the Joint Select Committee, and to ask that Committee to report as they think fit upon the question of the future Constitution of Burma. In the course of the debate on the Second Reading of the Bill, I was asked, I think by Lord Lamington, whether it would not be possible to refer the matter to the Select Committee without reading the Bill a second time. I told my noble friend then that it was impossible to refer the Bill until it had been read a second time. At that time I saw no other means of getting the question before the Committee, without asking your Lordships to read the Bill a second time. Since then, however, the White Paper has been published, and the object of the Government, I think, can be accomplished by referring that Paper to the Committee, over which my noble friend Lord Islington presides.

I wish, therefore, to make it clear that in adopting this course his Committee will be perfectly free to consider the whole question of the future Constitution of Burma. They can report in favour of the Government policy, or in favour of the policy suggested by the Government of India, or, if they think fit, they can recommend a policy differing from either of those two. We are prepared to leave the matter entirely to the discretion of the Committee, and I hope that it will, at the same time, consider the question raised in debate by Lord Selborne as to the desirability or otherwise of separating Burma from India. That is an equally important, although I venture to suggest not equally urgent, matter. The question of providing a Constitution is one of the utmost urgency, with which, I hope, it will proceed to deal with the least possible delay. The question of the separation of Burma from India is a matter which will certainly require a great deal of very careful consideration, and it may be that the Committee will not be able to find a solution of that question as quickly as they can find a solution of the question of the Constitution. In either case both matters will be at the discretion of the Committee to consider.

In conclusion, I desire to say that, providing my noble friend's Committee can report in time for the Government to proceed with its legislation before the end of this session, I should be quite willing to leave the debate on the Government of Burma Bill adjourned until such time as

the Report is published. Nothing, however, can deprive the Government of its responsibility for dealing with this situation, and the Government feels that it is absolutely necessary, by legislation or otherwise, that the question of the Constitution of Burma should be dealt with in the course of the present session. If, therefore, the Government is unable to obtain a Report from the Select Committee in time they may think it necessary to proceed without it. I do not anticipate for a moment that the Committee will have a difficulty in reporting in the course of the session, and provided that is done, I propose to leave the debate on the Second Reading of the Bill adjourned until such time as the Report of the Select Committee is before your Lordships.

LORD ISLINGTON: My Lords, one observation that I should like to make arising out of the speech of my noble friend is in regard to the second reference which he has proposed to the Select Joint Committee—namely, that we should consider whether Burma is to remain an integral part of the Empire of India, or whether it is to be detached and to become something in the nature of a *quasi*-Crown Colony or Dominion. I can see grave difficulty in the way of the consideration of the subject with that reference introduced. Whatever may be the course we take as a Committee in regard to the Government of Burma, I cannot conceive that it will be a course which can be divorced from contact with the Government of India. It will, therefore, be very difficult to consider the complete detachment of Burma in giving consideration to the immediate Constitution for Burma. I hope, however, that my noble friend means by his remarks that that may be a subsequent consideration; at any rate, a subsequent consideration of Parliament or the Government.

I think that there is great difficulty in the way of coupling the two problems of the Constitution for Burma and the question of detaching Burma from India. If the latter course is to be taken it would have a very important influence on the consideration of a Constitution for Burma, and would also raise a whole set of serious considerations which would require evidence quite outside the ordinary evidence that we should ask for in relation to a Constitution for Burma coupled with the Government of India.

The Earl of Lytton.

LORD SYDENHAM: May I ask the noble Earl if it is possible to refer the Government of Burma Bill to the Joint Select Committee before passing a Motion to that effect in your Lordships' House?

THE EARL OF LYTTON: I think I explained that that could not be done, but the subject contained in the White Paper which has been submitted to Parliament raises the same issue, and it can be so referred. That is the matter I propose to refer to the Joint Committee. Upon that White Paper the Burma Bill was drafted.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

[From Minutes of April 20, 1921.]

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Leave given to the Committee to report from time to time.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

[From Minutes of April 21, 1921.]

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

First Report from the Committee made, and to be printed.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Wednesday, 4th May, 1921.

THE ARMY IN INDIA.

LORD SYDENHAM. My Lords, I desire to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India the Question which stands in my name on the Paper—namely, whether he can state the extent of, and the reasons for, the intended reductions in the Indian Army—and to move for Papers. The reduction of the Indian Army at this juncture raises what are really great Imperial questions and, I think, needs more justification than it has yet received from anybody. Decisions which may have the most serious consequences seem to have been taken without the previous knowledge of Parliament, and I am quite certain that very few people in this country realise how serious is the step that is contemplated. Before the great Mutiny, the Indian Army consisted of 311,500 native and 39,500 British troops. That Army rendered great services overseas in Ceylon, Amboyna, Egypt, Macao,

Bourbon, Rodriguez, Java, Persia, Afghanistan, Burma and China. That was a great record, which is too often forgotten in these days.

After the disbandment of the revolted Bengal Army and the assumption of authority in India by the Crown, the Army was drastically reduced. It was reduced again about 1881 in consequence of the Report of the Eden Committee. But, following the Penjdeh scare in 1885, it was again greatly increased, regiments which had been broken up a few years previously were reconstituted, and a fourth squadron was added to the Cavalry regiments. In my humble opinion, the Russian menace to India was always an illusion, but it became a sort of obsession of the great forward school in India and it has for years powerfully influenced the whole of our policy throughout Asia. The menace of the Bolshevik autocracy to-day has assumed a far greater danger than anything that arose from the Russia of the Czars, and I cannot understand how anyone can believe that the situation is not more threatening to-day than it was in 1885 when we added largely to the Army. Since 1885 there have been further additions to the Army, more especially to the mountain artillery, and the fixed proportion of one to two and a-half has been established between the British and Native elements of that Army. That decision was arrived at after long and most careful consideration.

Briefly, that is how the Indian Army stood at the outbreak of war, when, of course, an immense increase became immediately necessary. About a million Indians served overseas, and some 60,000 of them were killed. I need not repeat what has been so often said in this House—how much the Empire owes to the gallant fighting classes of India which gave their lives freely in almost every theatre of war. The disbandment of the new levies was inevitable, but the reduction of the pre-war Indian Army is quite a different matter. We have been told that eighteen fine Cavalry regiments are to be abolished. As I said the other day, the Cavalry is the flower of the whole Indian Army. It is drawn from the pick of the yeoman classes of India, of which it is the hereditary profession. I am well aware of the opinion which has arisen after the campaign in France that Cavalry has depreciated greatly in importance. I believe that theory to be quite as baseless as some

of those which were drawn from the exceptional circumstances and conditions of the Boer War.

The noble Earl will probably say that aircraft, tanks, and armoured cars justify this very sweeping reduction of the Cavalry. Against that view stands the opinion of Field Marshal Lord Allenby, who states that these new elements add to the importance of Cavalry. He says :

“The battle value of Cavalry increases with the breadth of vision bestowed by aircraft. The Air Service by enlarging the horizon renders possible such bold strokes by masses of horsemen as were seen in Mesopotamia, Palestine and Syria.”

Then he goes on to say that tanks and armoured cars can also afford great assistance to cavalry.

No one can attach more importance to aircraft than I do, but it must be clear that against insurrectionary movements they are far inferior to the use of mounted men. The use of aircraft has been so much restricted in India that they would be almost impotent to deal with great disturbances. In any case the aviators cannot seize and hold a position, nor can they relieve a hard-pressed garrison. In place of breaking up those eighteen splendid Cavalry regiments, would it not have been wiser to have restricted the cadres of the whole of the other Cavalry regiments to three squadrons, which could have been expanded when war made it necessary? I do not know what reduction of Infantry is proposed, or whether it is intended to retain the proportions as between British and Indian troops which for many years was regarded as inviolable. I am quite certain that the noble Earl will make all these matters and the intentions of the Government of India and the India Office perfectly clear when he replies to me.

The danger to the peace of India, internally and externally, was never so great as it is now. The Dobbs mission has been in Cabul for four months and apparently has accomplished nothing. That is a humiliating fact which must tell against our prestige throughout the whole of the East. It is admitted. It has been admitted in this House that the Afghans, while negotiating with our Mission, concluded a Treaty with the Bolsheviks. Since then, according to the *Manchester Guardian*, a supplementary clause has been added to that Treaty providing for a subsidy of one million gold or silver roubles, and also the construction of a telegraph line

from Kustk through Herat and Kandahar to Cabul, with any technical assistance which may be required. The object of that telegraph line is obvious. But it is also reported now that another Treaty has been made with the Nationalist Turks by the Afghans. So it seems that the Afghans are rapidly falling under the influence either of the Bolsheviks, or of Pan-Islam, or possibly of both.

Besides that, fighting is now constantly taking place on the frontier, as we read almost every day. With a hostile Afghanistan, or even an unfriendly Afghanistan, frontier warfare would be far more serious and more continuous than it was in the past. In 1897 we employed 120,000 troops on the frontier, though the Afghans at that time were quite friendly to us. In the spring of 1919 when the Afghans invaded India, we required over 200,000 troops on the frontier, or, with non-combatants, about 300,000 men, though only part of the tribes rose at that time. Is the Government sure that when the Army is reduced as proposed it will be able to deal with the much greater troubles that may at any time arise on the frontier and at the same time be sufficient to preserve order in India?

The internal situation, in my opinion, was never so menacing as it is to-day. I am most anxious not to seem to exaggerate the situation, but I must say that some of the reports we receive are really most fallacious. Latterly, I have seen it said that Mr. Gandhi is rapidly losing his influence with the educated classes and that his non-cooperation movement is breaking down. That may be true to some extent, but what is forgotten is that his appeal to the ignorant and fanatical masses has aroused a feeling of race hatred which may take years before it subsides, if, indeed, it ever does subside. He has followed Mrs. Besant's earlier efforts but with much greater effect, working upon the masses and upon the boys and students, to imbue them with dislike and contempt not only of the British Government, but of all British officials in India, and the strength of that appeal lies in its religious aspects. Mr. Gandhi and his myrmidons teach that British rule is satanic, that it is the duty of all religious Indians to get rid of it. No one who has not lived in India can quite understand how dangerous such teaching is, especially when the teacher

Lord Sydenham.

claims, and is conceded, supernatural powers and supernatural sanction.

The Moslem extremists are even more violent in their language than Mr. Gandhi himself, and the wildest falsehoods about our treatment of the holy places of Islam have been widely circulated amongst the fanatical classes in India. During the last month we have seen two shocking outbreaks of violence, one at Malegaon in the Bombay Presidency, and the other on the Bengal coalfield. The police were easily overpowered, and loss of life and destruction occurred because troops were not available in time to deal with these disturbances. Then the forces of Bolshevism are certainly being brought to bear upon parts of India at the present time. The objects of the Bolsheviks, of course, differ from those of Mr. Gandhi and his associates, but they reinforce each other, because they both agree in the determination to turn us out of India.

The personal experience of a non-official Englishman and his young wife, who had just arrived in India, will show better than anything I could say what has been the effect of this continuous preaching of race hatred. This was written after a journey through the Punjab in March last—

"At the station we found ourselves in the midst of a crowd of the most menacing and hostile Indians I have ever seen. We appeared to be the only two Europeans anywhere near, and we at once received the attention of the whole crowd. They collected round our carriage, jeered at my wife—who, as you know, only arrived in this country last week—and finally decided to enter our carriage. A policeman on duty—the only one visible—kept some of them back, whilst I myself was able to keep the door closed against the remainder. The train fortunately started, and I had hoped all was well, but at each successive station the crowd got down from their carriages and endeavoured to get on to our compartment, sometimes from both sides, all the while shouting: 'Mahatma Gandhi ki Jai,' 'Hindu Mussalman ki Jai.' The experience for my wife, who is only a girl of twenty, was most terrifying, and for myself was one of the most trying experiences I have ever had. The crowd was practically in possession of the train. None had a ticket, and they all entered whichever compartment they pleased, only being kept out of mine by force. Fortunately, though prepared for it, I was not obliged to shoot, but it was a near thing, as had they succeeded in getting into our carriage I would have done so to protect my wife."

That was a crowd which had just been attending one of Mr. Gandhi's great demonstrations, and as so often happens in India now, it took possession of the train, and travelled without taking any tickets.

But that is not an isolated instance. I could give several more of the same kind. It shows clearly to what a pass things have come owing to the free preaching of race hatred against us. It seems to me that it will be almost impossible for Englishmen and Englishwomen to live much longer in India if that kind of thing can go on. Speaking in the Legislative Assembly on March 8, the Commander-in-Chief gave a plain warning of danger, both external and internal, and I cannot understand how he consented to these reductions before he could have had time to make himself completely master of the situation in India. Since the Mutiny, and before the great war, Indian troops have served in Abyssinia, Afghanistan, Egypt, Sudan, Somaliland, Burma, China and Malta, but all this seems as if it were now to be changed. According to the very remarkable Resolution passed by the Legislative Assembly on March 26, the Indian Army is no longer to be counted among the armed Forces of the Crown, as it has been hitherto. Henceforth it is to be employed only for defensive purposes in India, "except in very grave emergencies"—those are the words of the Resolution—"and with the consent of the Governor-General in Council" which might not be forthcoming in face of a hostile Assembly that might be dominated by the extreme Party. If, when we have reduced the Army, some emergency arose which needed reinforcements, we should have to supply those reinforcements, but there is no reciprocal obligation upon India at the present time, since the passing of this Resolution.

The Indian Army is a very delicate instrument which would easily break to pieces if it were mishandled. I do not think it is generally realised here that so long as we provide officers of the right type for the Indian Army we retain the affection and respect of the classes which, after all, are the most important classes in India, and the classes which will take charge of India when Home Rule arrives. For the present, at least, we remain absolutely responsible for the defence of the Indian frontiers, and for the preservation of internal order; and latterly, I am afraid, we have not effectively discharged that second task. I cannot believe that a democratic Government, formed on Western models and controlled, as it will always be in the years to come, by a very small minority, will ever be able to create and maintain an efficient Army. Left to herself, India will be open

to invasion, and India will most certainly be invaded. I cannot see how we can ever share with an Indian Parliament the control and organisation of a great Army.

I am well aware of the present financial stringency—which is due to many causes—some of which, I am afraid, will be permanent—and of the fact that we are replacing what was one of the most wonderfully cheap Governments in the world by a Government which will be far more expensive. There are reasons why there will be financial stringency in India for some years to come, but surely security comes before everything else, and I must warn His Majesty's Government that the weakening of our military forces at the present time may make it impossible for us to fulfil our grave responsibilities to the masses of India, and may very easily lead us to disaster. I beg to move for Papers showing the opinion of the late and present Commanders-in-Chief in India, and that of the Imperial General Staff, if taken, upon the intended reductions in the Indian Army.

LORD CHELMSFORD: My Lords, before the noble Earl, Lord Lytton, replies to the speech which has just been delivered by the noble Lord, I should like to say a few words on this very important matter, because I have been responsible during the past five years for the policy in India. I accept that responsibility, and I wish to place before this House the reasons for the various Questions which the noble Lord has raised this afternoon. In the first place I should like to draw the attention of the House to the particular Question and Motion which the noble Lord has placed on the Paper. He asks the Under-Secretary of State for India whether he can state the extent of, and the reasons for, the intended reductions in the Indian Army. The greater part of the noble Lord's speech was taken up with a lurid account of the condition of India at the present moment. I quite agree that the state of India and the external menace to India from Afghanistan and the tribes are factors which have to be taken into account in any reduction of the Indian Army, but one felt, listening to the noble Lord, that these were the matters to which he wished particularly to draw your Lordships' attention.

May I point out one interesting fact in reference to the letter which the noble Lord read to your Lordships. He gave as its

date March 9. That was at least three weeks before I left India, and the occurrence to which the noble Lord has drawn your Lordships' attention was never brought to my notice during those three weeks. Between March 9 and the date of my leaving India the Governor of the Punjab, who was my guest at Delhi, and with whom I had a long discussion with regard to the state of India, never mentioned any occurrence of this sort. He told me that with the exception of the Sikh problem, which resulted in the massacre of which your Lordships have heard, the other causes of unrest have greatly diminished, and that he was not anxious about the unrest with reference to the Punjab affairs of 1919, nor was he anxious in other directions. It is interesting to find that on March 9, at least ten days before the Governor of the Punjab paid me a visit, this very striking occurrence should have happened. I can only regret that it was not brought to my notice, and to the notice of the Governor of the Punjab at the time. We should certainly have taken action with regard to it.

The noble Lord asks the reasons for the intended reductions in the Indian Army. I can state them in a sentence. We in India attempted to cut our coat according to our cloth. We attempted to balance our income and expenditure. I know that is not a fashionable thing to do in these days, and it may be regarded as a somewhat insufficient reason. But in India we regarded it as a sufficient and as an imperative reason. In consequence of our very parlous financial position we cut down ruthlessly our civil expenditure far below the limits of efficiency, reducing some of our Departments almost to starvation estimates. But even then we could not balance our Budget, and so we had no alternative but to consider the position with regard to Army expenditure.

Noble Lords here will perhaps hardly realise the colossal increase which has taken place in the Army expenditure in India during the past five years. If I may, I will deal with figures which are familiar to those connected with India, though perhaps not so familiar to your Lordships. The Army in India this year is going to cost 62.20 crore of rupees, as against 26.11 crore of rupees in the last financial year before the war. That is more than double. Those are the only figures I shall mention. I doubt whether Lord Sydenham would ask me to go in detail into the figures for

Lord Chelmsford.

this year, though the financial problem is necessarily at the bottom of the situation. This increase is largely due to three causes. In the first place it is due to the very large rise in pay of the British soldier in India, which has practically trebled during the past three years; in the second place, to the largely increased expenditure on *matériel* and equipment of the Army in India, which found little or no place in the expenditure in 1913-1914; and, lastly, to the necessity which we, as the Government of India, were under to make up the leeway for past years of starvation in respect to military matters for which we, as a Government, could take no responsibility whatever—for instance, hospitals, barracks, and all those things which make for the health and welfare of the British and Indian soldier.

The Esher Committee made strong recommendations as to improvements in that direction. But before the Esher Committee had issued its Report we had ourselves taken steps to deal with this matter; and that is another reason why our military Budget assumed the colossal proportions it did this year as compared with previous Budgets. When I remind your Lordships that these figures represent more than 50 per cent. of the whole Budget of India, no one can doubt the seriousness of the situation. If you have a military Budget which is going to sterilise all civil development of the country, it is a matter which you have to take into serious consideration and see what steps can be adopted to remedy it.

We have taken it very seriously, and more than a year ago I appointed a Special Committee, consisting of members of the Council, to go into the whole question in detail. They found that while a certain laxity had grown up in expenditure as the result of the removal of the stringent financial supervision which had existed in pre-war days, they were not able to suggest any reductions which would obviate the necessity of having to deal with the number of troops in India. I remember the care with which every possible method of effecting some reduction in our Budget was explored, and they always came back to the only possible form which would enable us as a Government to balance our income and expenditure—namely, by a reduction in the *personnel* of the Army.

The noble Lord has drawn a lurid picture of the possible emergencies which the Government of India, or British rule in

India, may have to meet. He strongly urged that the Government of India should base its military strength on all the possibilities it may have to face. If you attempt to organise your military Forces on the basis that they should be sufficient to meet every possible emergency, I can only say that any Government which attempted to do so would head straight for bankruptcy. It is what no nation in the world attempts to do, and certainly not what His Majesty's Government at the present moment are attempting to do. If that is to be the basis on which His Majesty's Government should organise the Forces, I can only say that the present state of the Imperial Army is one of the greatest bluffs in history. It is obvious that our military Forces on the basis that they should be sufficient to meet all possible Imperial emergencies, are grossly insufficient. I repeat, that India must be allowed to base her requirements on reasonable probabilities; and it is on reasonable probabilities that the Government of India is taking up the question of the reduction of the Army as necessitated by our very parlous financial position.

I should like to say one word, before I come to the possible reduction of British troops in India, with regard to what the noble Lord said on the reduction of the Indian Cavalry. From first to last that has been an entirely military question. The late Commander-in-Chief, to whom I was talking the other day, had contemplated a reduction of the Cavalry in India. He left before the scheme by which that reduction was to be effected had been carried out. The present Commander-in-Chief took up the question where Sir Charles Monro left it, and the present scheme for reduction by the amalgamation of certain Cavalry regiments is, from first to last, a military scheme to meet the exigencies of the situation. No pressure of any sort has been put upon the Commander-in-Chief to carry out such reduction. It was first initiated by the late Commander-in-Chief, and carried through under the auspices of the present Commander-in-Chief, after very careful consideration on his part as to the best method of effecting the reduction.

The noble Lord, Lord Sydenham, has practically said that we were bringing about these reductions in India at great peril to the British *raj*. May I assure him that that was not our idea, and that we had examined that question before we made any suggestions with regard to

reduction. I would draw a distinction between troops which are required for the external defence of India and those which are required for internal security. As regards those required for external defence on the frontier and in connection with Afghanistan, no reduction was contemplated. In the scheme that we considered it was clearly laid down that there would be no reduction of British divisions which were essential for security from external invasion or disturbance.

When one comes to the question of whether it is possible to reduce the troops required for internal security, I would remind your Lordships of what I have already pointed out in connection with the expenditure on the Army, that as regards material and equipment our Army in India now is many times stronger than it was in 1913 and 1914. We have machine guns and Lewis guns to an extent which is colossal as compared with 1913 and 1914. We have a large motor transport service which did not exist at all in those years. We now have aeroplanes, and it is contemplated that we shall also have tanks. In all these respects the Indian Army has a vastly greater military strength than it had in 1913 and 1914. I think we may very fairly draw the deduction that for the purpose of internal security a single company of 1921, with its machine guns and Lewis guns and its capacity to get about the country by means of motor transport, can almost do the work of a battalion of 1913 and 1914. On that point I found that my civilian colleagues largely agreed with me.

It is natural that His Excellency Lord Rawlinson, the Commander-in-Chief, did not see altogether eye to eye with us. But no man could have worked more loyally, and with a greater desire to meet the financial side of the situation, than did Lord Rawlinson. He showed himself most reasonable and most ready in every way to try to meet our financial position. That question, however, is really immaterial, because we found, when we proposed this to His Majesty's Government, that the system of troops in India was so inextricably bound up with the British troops in England, owing to the system of linked battalions, that it was impossible for us to reduce any British troops in India without giving longer notice than had been proposed.

The whole question of the British troops has therefore been postponed for consideration at both ends—in India by a Committee

of the Executive Council. Had I remained as Viceroy in India I should have myself served on that Committee, because I can conceive of no consideration which is of greater importance to the whole question of the military strength of India than the ratio of British to Indian troops. When I left India, the matter had been settled in England. The noble Earl, Lord Lytton, will doubtless inform us as regards India. It was settled that in England this matter should be taken up before a Sub-Committee of the Imperial Defence Committee. At both ends it will be very carefully considered, and I feel confident that when Lord Sydenham hears that this is what is proposed and is being done, he will feel complete confidence in the two bodies who are now carefully giving their consideration to this most important matter

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (THE EARL OF LYTTON): My Lords, I think I can best answer Lord Sydenham's Question by first of all stating as clearly as I can the actual facts regarding the reductions in the Indian Army which have already been approved. I have already dealt with this matter on a previous occasion, but I should like to remind your Lordships what these reductions actually are. The total establishment of fighting units in India—that is, exclusive of troops at Aden, in the Persian Gulf, and in overseas garrisons outside India and Burma—the total strength allowed for in the Budget for 1921–1922 is less than the corresponding figures for 1914 by about 6,000 British ranks and 7,500 Indian ranks. With regard to British troops, the reduction has come about in this way. During the war a number of British units were withdrawn from service in India for service elsewhere, with the result that the numbers now are less than those before the war by one British Cavalry regiment and six British infantry battalions. With regard to the Indian troops the reduction of eighteen Cavalry regiments—that is, from 39 to 21—has been sanctioned, as I explained on a previous occasion, the Infantry battalions remaining the same.

As Lord Chelmsford has just reminded your Lordships, these reductions were made with the unanimous approval of the Government of India and with the complete assent of the late and the present Commanders-in-Chief. The reasons for them were, I think, as follows. In consequence of the improved equipment of the Army

Lord Chelmsford.

by the introduction of Lewis guns and Hotchkiss guns, by the improved machine guns and by the addition of armoured cars, tanks and aeroplanes, it was possible, in the opinion of the military advisers of the Government of India, to make these reductions in numbers without reducing the fighting efficiency of the Army. Lord Chelmsford has told your Lordships that in his opinion the Army to-day, in spite of these reductions, is far stronger and more capable of meeting the requirements of at any rate the internal situation in India than it was, with larger numbers, in 1914.

I am anxious to dwell upon this point, because on the last occasion when we debated the subject I was asked a supplementary question by Lord Crewe, and I said then that I thought the introduction of an Air Force had largely influenced the minds of those who had advised a reduction in the Army. I want to correct the impression which I then conveyed. Certainly the introduction of an Air Force was one of the factors, but it was only one factor. The better equipment of the Army, the better weapons, and, above all, the introduction of armoured cars, were matters which I think were even more important factors than the existence of an Air Force.

Those reductions, as I have said, have been made with the unanimous approval of the Government of India. They have been sanctioned by the Secretary of State, and they bring the Army of India to numbers which represent a provisional post-war strength of that Army. It is true, as Lord Chelmsford has told us, that the Government of India wished to make further reductions in the numbers of the *personnel* beyond a point to which the present Commander-in-Chief was prepared to agree, and possibly it is to those reductions that my noble friend has referred in his Question. The object of the Government of India in desiring to make further reductions was to reduce their present heavy military expenditure, and in this they were certainly neither alone nor peculiar. Even my noble friend himself, I think, would admit that it is desirable to reduce expenditure upon armaments, provided it is safe to do so.

The whole question really being what it is safe to do, my noble friend has given your Lordships reasons why, in his opinion, no further reductions should be made in the Indian Army at the present moment, and why, in fact, even those reductions that have been sanctioned were possibly

not consistent with considerations of safety. I would very briefly remind your Lordships of some reasons why every effort should and must be made to reduce expenditure upon armaments in India, as well as in other countries. They are reasons which, in the main, are common to all countries, reasons of which we are very conscious in this country, but many of them are reasons which weigh even more strongly in India than they do here. During the war expenditure upon armaments became so enormous that every other branch of the administration was necessarily starved, and the commercial, industrial and economic life of the nation, which was completely at a standstill during the war, is now anxious to expand, and for its expansion requires the expenditure of public money.

Two results, in particular, were caused by the war, both of which necessitate increased expenditure at the present time. They are both reflected in the figures which Lord Chelmsford has given to your Lordships of the present military expenditure in India. The first is an improved standard of comfort, and the second is the increased cost of almost every article. Money is wanted to-day for education, for houses, for rates, for every kind of development, and, above all, to meet the recent rise in wages; and I would remind your Lordships that the rise in wages applies also to the pay of the naval and military Forces. In consequence of the increased pay, of the improved equipment, and of the increased cost of everything, Lord Chelmsford has told us that the Army in India to-day is costing three times what it cost in 1914. Those are reasons which make it imperative for the Government of India to endeavour to reduce its expenditure on this head. Lord Sydenham has told us that in his view it is not safe at the present time to contemplate making economies by further reducing the strength of the Army, and he has referred to a number of incidents which he is right in thinking are a cause of great anxiety to those responsible for maintaining public order in India to-day.

In regard to the letter from which he quoted, Lord Chelmsford has told your Lordships that that letter was not brought to his notice before he left India. I think it probable that it never would have been brought to the notice of the Government of India by the writer, and yet your Lordships, I think, will agree that if there

is one person to whom the information contained in that letter is of the utmost importance it is the Viceroy, and his advisers. I can assure my noble friend, Lord Sydenham, therefore, that as soon as I became aware of the existence of that letter, and it was sent to me, we communicated by telegram with the Government of India to ask whether they were aware of the facts mentioned in it, and on learning from them that they have no knowledge of the incidents referred to, we shall send the letter to the Government of India, in order that they may make investigations regarding the occurrence, and take what steps may be necessary to prevent any possibility of its recurrence.

But, whether the picture drawn by the noble Lord is exaggerated or not, it is undoubtedly true that the situation is, and has been for a long time, very anxious, and, because of the existing unrest in India, we are told that it is really not possible to contemplate further reductions in the Army. But the Government of India have to consider the cause of the existing unrest and to deal with the removal of those causes, if possible, as well as with the suppression of unrest where it is evidenced. One cause, at any rate, of unrest in India to-day undoubtedly is the intolerable burden of taxation—a burden which we feel greatly in this country, but which is felt even more greatly in India. Consequently, the strongest possible pressure is put upon the Government, by public opinion in India, to produce economies, if possible, and naturally, after the successful issue of the war, to reduce expenditure upon armaments, if possible. It was natural, therefore, I think, that there should be some difference of opinion between the civil and military advisers of the Viceroy, or at any rate that the civil and military advisers should look at the question from slightly different points of view, one body desiring to reduce the military expenditure in order to make the country more contented, the other advising that so long as unrest existed it was not safe to make further reductions.

The proposed reductions and the opinions of the Government of India and of the Commander-in-Chief were conveyed, of course, to the Secretary of State, and he had to decide what action he should take in the matter. I need not assure your Lordships that the Secretary of State and his advisers at the India Office felt the utmost sympathy with the Government of India in their desire to effect greater

economy. But on one thing we were quite determined, and that was that though the Army in India ought to be reduced to the minimum which was compatible with safety, considerations of safety, and not of economy, must ultimately be the determining factor. I feel sure that my noble friend will be glad to know that that was the view taken by the Secretary of State in Council, and that although he is entirely with the Government of India in wanting to effect such economy as can be made consistently with the military needs of the situation, he is also determined that whatever Army is necessary—and, in the opinion of the body to whom it has been referred, necessary for the external and internal defence of India—that Army must be maintained.

The question, therefore, is not what Army can we afford, but what is the minimum force which the military situation in India requires? The Government have decided to submit this question to a body which, I feel sure my noble friend will agree, is the most competent body to give us advice on the subject—namely, the Committee of Imperial Defence. That Committee will, of course, hear all sides of the question, and, as Lord Chelmsford has reminded your Lordships, the Viceroy is appointing a Committee of his Executive Council to prepare material to lay before the Committee of Imperial Defence. The Secretary of State has given an assurance in the House of Commons that, until this Committee of Imperial Defence has made its report, no further reductions beyond the point to which I referred at the beginning of my remarks will be sanctioned.

I have not entered, and I do not propose to enter, into a discussion of the merits of either the reductions which have been made, or those which have been suggested for the future. I do not propose to take up the point raised by Lord Sydenham as to whether it is, or is not, safe at this moment to make further reductions, because the matter is at the moment *sub judice*, and it is being considered by a body far more competent to give an opinion on the subject than I am. I hope, therefore, your Lordships will agree that the Government has taken the best steps for determining what are the military requirements of the situation, and I have assured your Lordships that, when that is determined, they will not agree to reducing the Army below what is necessary in view of that military situation. They have also

The Earl of Lytton.

given an assurance that no further reductions will be made until the Committee of Imperial Defence has expressed its opinion. My noble friend will see that whilst that Committee is pursuing its labours it would not be possible for me to undertake to produce the opinion of individuals who will appear and give evidence before it, or to lay any Papers on the subject. I hope that he will be satisfied with the assurance I have given him, and that I have been able to remove some, at any rate, of his anxieties.

LORD SYDENHAM: I beg leave to withdraw my Motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 31st May, 1921.

INDIAN DIVORCES (VALIDITY) BILL. [H.L.]

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (THE EARL OF LYTTON): My Lords, I ask leave to introduce a Bill dealing with the validity of Indian divorces, and beg to move that it be read a first time.

Moved, That this Bill be now read 1^a.—
(*The Earl of Lytton.*)

On Question, Bill read 1^a, and to be printed.

DEFENCE OF NORTH-WEST FRONTIER.

LORD MONTAGU OF BEAULIEU: My Lords, I beg to move that leave be given to advance to this day the Notice (relating to the measures taken for the defence of the North-West frontier of India) which now stands for Wednesday the 8th of June next.

THE EARL OF CRAWFORD: The Government has no objection to the Motion.

Moved accordingly, and, on Question, Motion agreed to.

LORD MONTAGU OF BEAULIEU: My Lords, I rise now to ask His Majesty's Government what steps, military and civil, are being taken to provide for the efficient defence of the North-West frontier of India; and to move for Papers. In doing so I would like to thank your Lordships for allowing me to advance the Question

to this afternoon, in order to meet the convenience of the noble Earl who represents the Government of India in this House. I need not apologise for raising the question of the North-West frontier of India. It has always been an important part of the Empire, and has increased in importance during late years owing to the fact that we have now to consider not only the question of the tribes on the frontier and a friendly or unfriendly Afghanistan, but the danger which may arise from a new kind of Russia beyond the North-West frontier more difficult to deal with than the Russia of the past.

The North-West frontier of India is the only military frontier in the whole of the Empire. It is over a thousand miles long from Gwadar to Chitral, and represents over 1,500 miles of actual frontier. We have to face to-day not only the armed forces of Afghanistan, a more or less organised State, but something like 300,000 or 400,000 armed tribesmen who live in the district around the frontier, and that fact alone would justify me in bringing forward the Question. These tribesmen in the past—I am speaking now of ten or twenty years ago—were only partially armed. They are now armed with modern rifles and have become a much more formidable force. They have been able to get their rifles not only from imported sources, but by theft from us, by overpowering our small guards. In addition, one rifle factory, if not two factories, may be found almost within the borders of the frontier. These rifles are not of first-class manufacture, but they can kill if held straight.

To face this always present danger we have two divisions, the 1st at Peshawar and the 4th at Quetta, and three frontier brigades at Kohat, Bannu, and Dik. If we put the total of that force at 50,000 men we are not over-estimating it. Owing to the nature of the country and the fact that communication is very difficult, the force is not very easily moved about. There is a great lack of lateral communication on the frontier, and it is wonderful that so small a force has been able to hold this long line of frontier without a serious reverse. We have had outposts overpowered here and there, but, on the whole, the line has been held exceedingly well. One reason why we have never suffered very seriously is that the tribes have not combined. If there had been any combination with Afghanistan the position would have been very serious indeed.

(D 1441—I.)

Though we have been engaged in a series of wars with the Mahsuds in the south and the Waziris in the centre, luckily we have never been engaged with both at the same time, and that fact has enabled us to move forces to the districts attacked with comparative ease.

We have now to meet a situation in which, from religious or political motives, agitators may go among the tribes and stir them up to a united attack. In asking the House to consider this matter I am bringing it forward in order to elicit from the Government whether, with the concurrence of the Government of India, they have in contemplation any change with regard to the frontier, or whether they think the present state of affairs, if not satisfactory, is inevitable. There has been no real peace on the North-West frontier of India for many years. During the last three or four years the raids have grown into a continuous series of small wars, with the result that the casualties have been comparatively heavy. The Secretary of State published a Paper giving the details of some of these casualties, and it appears that in two years ending in February last no fewer than 5,169 officers and men have been killed or have died of wounds or disease, 3,474 wounded and 829 missing—a total of 9,472. A proportion of these casualties occurred during the Afghan War, and they cannot, therefore, all be put down to the tribal warfare which has continued; but many of them have been suffered since the Afghan War.

Another serious disadvantage with which we have to contend is the lack of good water, with the diseases arising from bad water. When I was there in 1917 and in 1919 I had an opportunity on more than one occasion of coming into contact with those responsible for medical administration, and I found that 62 per cent. of the casualties from disease came from water borne, or what may be called preventable, causes. Perhaps the noble Earl will be able to tell us whether the system of motor lorry filters, which I vocate advery strongly, is being continued and whether it is being extended. Though our sense of proportion has been somewhat altered by the casualties of the great war, and though we have been rather accustomed to regard war as a normal state of things, yet we must remember that these casualties are greater than any that have occurred in previous years over this area. The North-West frontier for about two hundred miles is in a

constant state of ferment, and I see no reason to anticipate that we can do anything but keep stronger forces there in order to meet the attacks made upon us.

This entails a certain expenditure upon the Government of India, who are by no means anxious to spend money in these days, as their revenue is not elastic while the expenditure is constantly increasing. I desire to suggest a policy to the Government which may save lives and also a large expenditure of money in the future. Let us consider for a moment our strategical position. It is an extraordinarily bad one. We are in possession of, or at any rate have to protect, various valleys which run up into the hinterland beyond our own country. These valleys constitute four dangerous salients running into the enemy's country. We have to protect the cultivated ground in the valleys where there is population. The enemy, on the other hand, has nothing to lose, because the troops that attack live upon or behind the frontier hills. The result of this is that we have to maintain isolated garrisons at the end of a long line of road, or road and railway, such as up to Parachinar, 120 miles from the base at Kohat. We have to maintain these garrisons without any proper lateral communication, which involves going down a great many miles to the main communication road in order to get supplies or to assist the wounded. That is inherently a bad strategical position, and these four salients, which might be reckoned as the Kyber, the Kurram, the Tochi and the Gomal, are very dangerous from a military point of view.

Until quite lately we have not had sufficiently good roads up these valleys, and, as a result, our communications have been faulty. I must, however, pause for a moment to say that both the late Viceroy, Lord Chelmsford, and his predecessor, Lord Hardinge, were most anxious to do all in their power during their terms of office to improve existing roads and to build additional roads, and I received the greatest assistance from them when it was my duty to have to do with such matters. But much improved as many of the roads are, we need more roads, especially lateral roads.

Then there are the disadvantages of a very bad climate. Possibly I am the only member of this House, or at any rate the only member present to-day, who has ever

Lord Montagu of Beauvoir.

had the misfortune to live in those valleys during a portion of the summer. The temperatures are just as bad as those of Mesopotamia. The day temperature ranges from 110 degrees to 120 degrees, or even 125 degrees in the shade and the nights are particularly hot. I remember nights when the temperature reached 105 degrees or 108 degrees in the shade. That is a climate and those are temperatures which the white man, as a rule, cannot stand, at any rate for any length of time. There have been sad episodes at one or two frontier stations due to men's nerves breaking down under the strain of the climate and of the kind of warfare, with which I will not weary the House to-day. When I was there, our men had nothing like the same comforts as the troops in Mesopotamia, at Bagdad, or on the Tigris or Euphrates. The time has come when we should give to the troops on this frontier every possible comfort in the way of ice-making machines, electric fans, and, if possible, local hill stations as well. A few more hill stations on the frontier between Cherat and Quetta would be of immense service to the troops.

We have now, I think, reached a stage when the Government of India will before long have to face two alternative policies. Of course, it is possible that we may go on along the lines foreshadowed by Lord Morley in his period of office as Secretary of State for India, a policy of going as little forward as possible, remaining in the Valley of the Indus, or even (at one time) having in contemplation retirement behind the Indus, except for the Peshawar plain. Nowadays that would be a suicidal policy. We must maintain our prestige on the North-West frontier. If it once broke down, and the people of that country thought that we were weakening in any way in our power to govern, it would react on India in a very serious way, and might, indeed, be the beginning of the end so far as large portions of the population were concerned. We might stay where we are and put up with these constant wars. That, I think, is a policy which leads you nowhere.

On the other hand, I think it might be the wiser policy to take over the whole country and the tribes—the Mahsuds, the Waziris and the rest of them—and administrate them as a regular part of India. That would have many advantages. At any rate, you would probably not have to keep more troops than at present, and, in addition, you would be able to get hill stations for your troops during the summer,

which would be a most desirable development from every point of view. Those who were loyally disposed and wanted to trade with British India would be able to do so without serious interruption. I feel certain that the present policy combines the two disadvantages of unsound military strategy and thoroughly bad hygienic conditions, and I am sure that before long the Government of India will have to reconsider the whole position.

I come now to another portion of the frontier, upon which I hope the noble Lord who answers this Question for the India Office will be able to give the House some information. Until about seven or eight years ago there was only one road up the Khyber Pass which was fit for the use of motor vehicles. Between 1915 and 1918 we began the construction of a second road which was nearly finished before I left India in 1919. The road was not so perfect as it might have been, but it was most valuable to our troops during the Afghan War. I might even go so far as to say that if it had not been for the second road up the Khyber it would have been almost impossible to maintain beyond that point the troops necessary to overcome the forces of the Afghans. Two years ago I was delighted to find that the Government of India carried out a recommendation which I made that there should be a wire ropeway in the Khyber Pass. This has been completed, and has lately taken over twenty tons of stores a day to the summit. That is a step in the right direction.

Quite recently a trunk railway line has been extended up the Khyber Pass and I hope the noble Lord will be able to give the House, with due consideration of public policy, any details he can as to the construction of that line, how he proposes to protect it, and where the terminus is to be. If it is only to go to the frontier at Lundi Kotal it will not be very much good in case further trouble occurs with Afghanistan. I have heard that some arrangement has been made by which we can extend the line to Dakka. No doubt the noble Lord will tell us whether that is the case. The line will be difficult to make from an engineering point of view and it will also be difficult to protect. It will be subject to sniping, and to a sudden descent of the enemy from the very steep and high hills on either side. It will, therefore, need many efficient and well placed defences to prevent the interruption of the line and

to secure the protection of supplies upon which will depend the safety of our troops at the frontier.

Perhaps the noble Lord will also tell us what attitude is adopted by the Afghans towards this line, and what view is taken of this point by our Mission at Kabul. If I know anything of Oriental diplomacy it is that it delights in delay until something happens which turns to the advantage of the Power with whom we are negotiating. Unless that Mission can report definitely that it has been able to achieve something it would be more dignified for us to withdraw it or to intimate to the Government of Afghanistan that it cannot be left there indefinitely. At the present moment it has achieved but little and the danger of leaving it there must be apparent.

As regards other railways on the frontier, I suggest that the time has come when an extension of some of them should be considered. There is a railway which runs from Kohat to Thal. That was originally planned to go on to Parachinar, the nearest place from which British troops could reach Kabul. Parachinar is also suitable for the use of aeroplanes. The head of the line there would be only ninety miles distant from Kabul, and an extension to Parachinar is very desirable. Then we have a possible extension of the railway from Bannu to Dardoni or Miranshah up the Tochi valley. I have seen convoys of camels five miles in length winding up this valley. Constantly they are being attacked and the raiders get off scot-free with a great deal of loot. I suggest that there are only two ways of sending convoys up these valleys. One is by motor lorries accompanied by armoured car, and the other is by train with an armoured locomotive and armoured trucks. Otherwise, we shall go on losing lives and a great deal of property belonging to the Government, owing to the raids of the population who live a few miles away from the road.

The third railway extension which I should be pleased for the Government to consider would be an extension of the line which runs at present to Tank and has been extended a short way to Murtaza. It might be extended to the south by the Zhob Valley to Quetta. I am afraid that these names will not be familiar to all of your Lordships, but it is necessary that I should get them on the Paper so that I may get a reply. Generally speaking, my object is to ask the Government to con-

sider whether an extension of the railways as well as the roads in a westerly direction up these valleys is not advisable and will not result, in the long run, in saving lives and money.

Another railway has been built to the south of Quetta by Nushki to Dusdap on the Persian frontier. This line is, of course, an entirely strategical line. It can never convey any quantity of produce and it runs through the most dreary and dismal country which it is possible to conceive. Is it intended that this line should stop at Dusdap or be continued on to Bandar Abbas or into Persia? The extension of this line seems wasted to a large extent unless you are prepared to keep something like 200 miles of line permanently in order for military contingencies. It seems to me that you must do something with your line and connect it with some terminus or centre of trade whereby you may get some return for your money.

Now I come to the question of lateral roads, and here I think I have the sympathy of the General Staff in India. The necessity for lateral roads on the frontier is very great. You have these dangerous salients running into the enemy's country, and you have to go back to the base before getting into the next valley. I suggest that this question of making lateral roads should be seriously considered now. One from Thal to Edak *via* Spinwan is under construction. That road is very important as one which links up the garrisons at Parachinar and Thal with that at Dardoni, and runs through a country which is liable to be constantly disturbed. Those lateral roads are essential from a strategical point of view. It is impossible to relieve these distant garrisons unless you have lateral means of communication.

I suggest to the Government of India that they should seriously consider also the question of the Kohat Pass road, which I should think is unique on any frontier. It is the road between two parts of British India, and passes through a country which at any time may rise against you, and which contains two rifle factories where rifles are being made for the purpose of shooting at our troops. If we consider it wise to allow the rifle factories to go on we should at least make the road through the Pass secure. Otherwise, the relief by the 1st division of any garrison at Kohat would have to be carried out from a long way round by railway. The improvement of the road through the

Lord Montagu of Beaulieu.

Pass is a question which should be carefully considered by the General Staff in India, and I assume that it has not been done because of financial rather than political reasons. In connection with that road the other road from Khusalgarh to Golra on the Grand Trunk route should be made. It was the subject of my recommendation more than three years ago, and until it is made the garrison at Kohat may at any time be in serious danger.

I have heard it said that with the improved service of railways east of the Indus there is not the same necessity for roads as there was. I do not agree. Roads must be always the prime means of communication. The extension of roads also will make for peace, because the civilising effect of a road everywhere on a frontier, especially in India, is very great. Trade begins to flow down a road, people settle along it, they find that trade pays them better than warfare, and the road exercises very great influence for peace and law and order. Of course, it goes without saying that on the North-West frontier we must use all the modern methods of warfare. We must use aeroplanes. I should like to see the Government of India use airships as well. You can never observe properly from an aeroplane. I have tried it myself and failed. You must have something that hovers and can remain still. Immediately the tribesmen hear the noise of a propeller they lie down and look from above like rocks. I have known several hundreds of men hide in the hillside and it has not been possible to see them until you get close to the ground. You need one or two airships.

In addition, you must have armoured cars to protect convoys. I know that the Government of India thoroughly agree with that suggestion. They have recently done a great deal in adding to the motor transport, have now got things on a better basis than they have ever existed in my time, and, I think I may say, have produced almost a revolution in the methods of defence on the North-West frontier. But we want more motor transport on the frontier even now. There are cases in which camels and mules are being used where certainly motor transport should be employed, and I suggest that also to the Government of India. In that connection I might mention the interesting fact that this year is the fiftieth anniversary of the use of motor traction in India. It was in 1871 that Colonel Crompton, who

is still alive, used—at the suggestion, I believe, of Lord Mayo, then Viceroy of India—a small kind of traction engine with rubber tyres, and I believe that was the first time that a mechanical vehicle was used in any country in the world to any extent. They took loads up to 20 tons.

We shall have to keep troops to a large extent on the frontier for many years. But I am convinced that if we make more roads, if we extend our railways, and if, above all, we go into these countries, which have been consistently in a state of unrest for a long time—places like the country of the Mahsuds and the country of the Waziris—and take them over, we shall not want more troops, but fewer. But until then we have to look forward to a time of increasing unrest on that frontier and to the necessity for more troops every year.

I know that a great deal has been said in India, and here also, about the high proportion of military to civil expenditure and also to the total Revenue raised. I thoroughly admit the force of that argument. It does seem a very large proportion to spend something like 50 per cent. of the Revenue of India on military preparation. But India is in a very peculiar situation. In no other part of the Empire have you a frontier one thousand miles long, and half a million men ready to rise against you. That is really the secret of what appears to be the excessive expenditure upon military matters in India. You will never get rid of that expenditure so long as you have a frontier which is liable to be disturbed. But if you were once to have a serious reverse on your frontier, if, for example, you were to lose command of the Peshawar Plain or places of less importance, that would precipitate a very serious crisis in India for the Administration. Many of the Indian peoples would then think that you were not strong enough to go on governing India, and your prestige would fall very seriously.

Therefore in bringing forward this Motion to-day I have done so with the firm conviction that the North-West frontier of India is a subject of increasing importance. I feel certain that the noble Lord who answers for the India Office will agree with me that the present policy is not satisfactory; it is expensive in men, and also in money. I suggest that the whole question should be reconsidered, and that some effort should be made whereby this constant loss of men and treasure might be

avoided. After all, if you cannot defend your frontiers which are the keystone of power your arch will fall. I beg to move.

LORD SYDENHAM: My Lords, this Question is one of very great importance to the people of India and also to us who are responsible for their security against murder and robbery on a large part of the frontier of India. It was in 1849 that we annexed the Punjab, and then, in the words of Sir Alfred Lyall, "we carried our territorial frontier across the Indus right up to the foot of the Afghan hills." I fancy that the people who made that momentous decision very little realised at the time where it would lead us, and what it involved. But from that time onwards we have been always confronted with this great problem of the frontier tribes, and that problem has led to a very heavy total loss of life and treasure in the past.

Some years after the annexation passed before we even realised the main factors of the problem of the frontier, and at first I think it must be said that we never had any policy of any kind. There was a long period of raids and counter-raids, leading to innumerable small and great expeditions, which went no way whatever towards solving the great problem of the frontier. After that, with the greater knowledge we had gained, we avoided interference with the domestic affairs of the tribes, but we set up a system of subsidies and of levies, local and tribal, which system, as your Lordships are well aware, was very largely extended and developed by the noble Earl the Leader of this House.

It was then possible to withdraw troops to some extent from the frontier and to replace them by the new Militia forces, and it was claimed for that policy—and I think rightly claimed—that it exerted a civilising influence over the tribes. On the whole it proved remarkably successful for nearly twenty years, during which it was tried. But, of course, a great deal depended also upon the capability of the officers whom we employed there. Then there was a bad set-back when we temporarily abandoned the Khyber Pass, and that led to the desertion of a considerable number of our Militia force. But in 1919, at the time of the Afghan invasion, the desertions were on a much greater scale and a considerable part of our levies disappeared

carrying with them their rifles and their military knowledge, either to the Afghans or to the frontier tribes.

Present conditions, so far as I can understand them, do not seem to be quite favourable to a return to this policy on a large scale; because a new generation has grown up among the tribes, a generation which has forgotten the lesson we administered in 1897, and, as the noble Lord has said, the tribes now are far better armed and better trained than their predecessors were. It is always the young tribesmen who are easily accessible to the preaching of the Mullahs, and they can at any time be led either to attack their neighbours or to make a raid into British India. Lord Kitchener, with whom I once discussed this question, was, I believe, entirely in favour of occupying the whole of the tribal territory right up to the Durand line, which is, I think, what my noble friend is now advocating. That was the logical policy, because as a buffer State the tribal territory had proved a most dismal failure. But it would have been very costly, and it would not have been popular probably with the Army, because it would have led to the Army being distributed in a good many posts among the mountains in very unpleasant conditions. I am doubtful whether this policy is now possible because of the doctrine of self-determination which, as Mr. Lansing said the other day, "is loaded with dynamite," and which appears to have a good many supporters in this country. There would be a good many people who would say you must not by force impose your rule upon these unwilling and hitherto wholly independent tribes.

The constant troubles on the frontier during the last two years—and they have been worse almost than in any other period that I remember—have forced upon the Government of India, as I understand, a partial adoption of Lord Kitchener's plan. In reply to some very severe questioning in the Legislative Assembly of India, Dr. Sapru stated on behalf of the Government the other day that—

"His Majesty's Government in May last sanctioned the military occupation of the central portion of the Mahsud territory, together with the construction of roads, which experience has shown to be one of the most effective of pacifying influences."

As I understand, that policy is to be applied to the Mahsud territory south of Tochi Pass, and I assume that it means that a really good motor road will be made up to

Lord Sydenham.

and beyond Bannu and also from Tonk to Wano. Whether there will be a lateral road—and the lateral roads are extraordinarily important—connecting the Tochi and the Gomal routes I do not know; nor do I know whether the road is to be pushed beyond Kohat into the Orakzi territory. I understand that it is also definitely decided that the railway should be extended from Peshawar to Landi Kotal, but to extend it across country through tribal territories between the Khyber and Kurram routes seems impossible.

The objects of the Government of India, as disclosed in this answer, seem to be to occupy positions of strategic importance and to connect them with railheads by motor transport, which is far less vulnerable than the ordinary convoy, which may be said to invite attack. This policy constitutes a somewhat new departure and, perhaps, might be described as, in a sense, experimental. The Government of India have stated that it must take some time and that it would cost a considerable amount of money, but, so far as I understand this policy, it seems to be both sound and wise. Road-making is almost always a gain to any country, as the noble Lord has said, and if we are to hold posts in tribal territory they must be within easy and rapid access of the railheads of India. This policy will bring us into closer touch with the Mahsud Waziris and it may be regarded by the other tribes as involving a menace to their independence. It certainly is a policy which, once announced—and it has been announced—must be rigorously carried through to the end without any halting or intervals of delay.

My noble friend has dealt with the aeroplane question most effectively, but I think it must be said that aeroplanes on the frontier generally have proved somewhat disappointing, though that is, of course, because certain parts of the country are eminently unfitted for their use. They will undoubtedly find many uses, and I hope that a good type will be provided in future, which, I think, has not always been the case in the past.

The *crux* of the frontier problem in the future, I believe, lies really with our relations with Afghanistan. I am afraid at the present time, as my noble friend has said, that those relations are very far from being satisfactory. The Amir appears to have made a Treaty with the Bolsheviks and also with the Nationalist Turks, while,

at the same time, he seems to have been playing with our Mission at Kabul. Then the Bolsheviks have also made a Treaty with the Kemalist Government at Angora, while we have made a commercial Treaty with the Bolsheviks. Was there ever such a tangle of Treaties as that? Who can possibly say what will come out of it all? What is certain is that an unfriendly Afghanistan, or an Afghanistan which is dominated by Bolsheviks or by Pan-Islam, would add immensely to our difficulties, which are sufficiently great already. I understand—I hope that the noble Earl will be able to say it is not true—that the Bolsheviks have already been trying to tamper with the tribes on the frontier, and, as we all know, money in that part of the world will suffice at any time to bring off a raid. I can see no sign at present that the Jewish Government at Moscow has carried out an important part of its Treaty engagements with us.

I read in the Indian papers the other day that Mr. Gandhi had stated that he would not tolerate an Afghan invasion, which some of his allies seemed rather to desire. I am afraid that is not a very sufficient or effective defence for the Indian frontier, which must remain for a long time a source of anxiety in spite of Mr. Gandhi's wonderful oratorical powers. For many years the responsibility for the frontier must rest wholly upon us, and cannot rest upon the new form of government which we are imposing upon India. Your Lordships may not realise that the new Legislative Council in India, which, as I have already said, is dealing, or wishes to deal, with frontier questions, rests upon the votes of 180,000 out of 245,000,000 people in British India. That is just as if the House of Commons was returned by considerably less than 40,000 voters and yet called itself representative of the masses. The main thing, after all, will be the efficiency of the Army in India and its readiness for action at all times on the frontier. That must continue to be the chief security of the people of India, and I must confess, as I said the other day, that I am alarmed at the extent of the reductions which have been made already.

Whatever we do the frontier must continue to make heavy demands upon the Budget of the Government of India, but I should like to point out that some of the figures which are given are, to a certain extent, misleading. Those figures, as I understand them, relate only to the

Revenues which are handled by the Government of India and which naturally appear very high in comparison with the corresponding figures of other countries. But if the percentage is taken upon the whole of the Revenues of India, both Imperial and Provincial, I think it will be found to be very moderate, having regard to the exceptional conditions of danger which my noble friend has so ably described. I am very glad that he has raised this Question to-day, because it will enable the noble Earl to clear up a great many points which, to me, as an obsolete soldier, are not yet quite clear.

VISCOUNT CHELMSFORD: My Lords, before the noble Earl replies I should like to say a word or two with regard to the very interesting speech which the noble Lord, Lord Montagu, has made with reference to the frontier of India. While I was in India the Government of India were very much indebted to the noble Lord for his expert assistance in connection with roads and motor transport. But I cannot help thinking, if he will permit me to say so, that he is rather apt to look at these things through his motor goggles. There are many other items of expenditure on which the military authorities in India spend large sums. It is quite true that motor transport and roads are most essential matters, but they must take their places with other essential things which are required for military purposes.

The noble Lord very properly pointed out that the tribesmen on the frontier are a much more formidable force at the present moment than they were a good many years ago. That is due in the main to two causes. It may be within the recollection of your Lordships that at the beginning of the war all the trans-border Pathans had to be disbanded from our Indian regiments as, owing to their religious proclivities, we had found that they were not to be relied upon. When those trans-border Pathans had been dispensed with throughout the Indian Army as a portion of our fighting forces they naturally went back to the tribes from which they had originally come. Similarly, under the frontier policy which had prevailed for some twenty years, as the noble Lord, Lord Sydenham, has pointed out, the whole of the Militia system on the frontier, with the exception of a certain portion of Militia and the Kurram Rifles which

remained firm because they were Shiah in the midst of Sunnies, crumbled away, and all those men returned to their tribes, taking with them, as Lord Sydenham has pointed out, not only their rifles but their military knowledge.

It is an extremely interesting fact that in the last Mahsud campaign about a year ago the Mahsuds attacked us under the strictest military discipline. They advanced to the sound of the whistle and had covering fire very carefully arranged to cover their advance. In fact, they were well instructed in all the latest military devices which had been taught our Army by our officers. On that side you have a much more formidable problem to-day on the North-West frontier than you had twenty years ago. But you have also this element in the situation, that owing to the dilution of our Indian Army during the great war our Indian troops are not up to the same standard of training, especially in frontier warfare, as they were in pre-war days. I happened to proceed along the frontier at the end of the Afghan War, going up to Dakka and other places that the noble Lord mentioned. During that tour I took occasion to question the commanding officer of every Indian regiment and I was informed, that only about 20 per cent. of his regiment were trained men, that the rest were recruits who had been brought in for the purposes of the great war and were insufficiently trained, and that with all the trained officers there was only one officer besides himself who had had any experience in frontier warfare.

I well recollect that a certain Brigadier-General, who visited me at Simla in 1920, told me that he found that it was necessary during the course of the last expedition to place the pickets himself. The noble Lord, Lord Sydenham, will realise that placing the pickets in advance on the frontier is a matter that is usually done by a subaltern, or a captain. That was the condition of the training of our troops when we had to undertake the very formidable operations the other day. You have, therefore, a combination on the one hand of the increased efficiency of the frontier tribes, and, on the other hand, of a great decrease in efficiency on the part of our troops. The consequence was that during the Afghan campaign and the recent operations we had to use forces in numbers out of all proportion to those that have been necessary in previous campaigns. So far as the efficiency of our troops is concerned,

Viscount Chelmsford.

I hope that is only a matter of time. They are learning every day, especially those who are up now in the Mahsud country. That is the concrete position with regard to the fighting on the frontier.

Taking the larger question, the noble Lord, Lord Montagu, put before us two alternative policies. One was "Stay where you are"; the other, "take over the tribes." That is putting it baldly. The noble Lord, Lord Sydenham, pointed out that for the last twenty years the policy, which is identified very largely with the noble Earl, Lord Curzon, had been eminently successful. But we have to remember that that was so largely because we had no Afghan trouble during that time. It was when Afghanistan intervened, and when the whole religious question came to the fore, that the tribes threw in their lot with their co-religionists. The whole trouble began with the incursion of the Afghan Army in 1919. With regard to the "Stay where you are" policy, we were able last year to make a real departure from that policy in connection with the Mahsuds. We obtained leave from His Majesty's Government to advance into the Mahsud country, to occupy that country, and to make a quadrilateral of roads. I am afraid that I cannot at this moment recollect the exact corners of the quadrilateral, but those roads would settle the whole position in the Mahsud country. That is a policy which is entirely in accord with what Lord Montagu put forward to-day. But it is one thing when you are dealing with a small area, and it is another thing to take over a whole country—a most difficult country—where, as the noble Lord has pointed out, there are some 400,000 fighting men. It is a big proposition to take over the whole of that country right up to the Durand line. However, what we did may have the effect of being a salutary warning to the other tribes that if they misbehave in the same way that the Mahsuds have misbehaved the same fate would overtake them. I should be inclined to allow the Government of India ample time in which to follow the policy that they have adopted with reference to the Mahsuds.

Both noble Lords have alluded to the Afghan Mission. I think we must be patient in the matter of the Afghan Mission. If I am not incorrect, Sir Louis Dane's Mission, which went out there in Lord Curzon's time, was there over a year, and when it came down it had not accomplished very much. I have every hope,

however, that we are going to accomplish something through the more recent Mission. At all events, we have accomplished this already. Except for communications with Afghanistan, letters passing between us and the Amir, we have had no thrashing out of the misunderstandings which existed between Afghanistan and ourselves from the date of the Dane Mission until the Mussoorie Conference of last year. The discussions which are now going on will, I am confident, have a very salutary effect, inasmuch as they will make Afghanistan realise how far we are prepared to go and what we are not prepared to do. After all, if we achieve that it will be something. I am hopeful with regard to it.

We have to remember that Orientals procrastinate in their negotiations; indeed, they would not regard it as being consonant with their dignity unless they took some time over discussions of this sort. Therefore, we must be patient, but I have every hope that we may get something really valuable out of the work of the Mission which is now at Kabul. I will not say any more, because I think it will be most unfortunate if, at this time, when the Mission is still negotiating, anything were to be said here which might in any way be misunderstood, or which would prejudice those negotiations. I should, however, like to say that I think the Government of India owe a very great debt to Sir Henry Dobbs, the head of that Mission, for the admirable patience and wonderful skill with which he has conducted the conversations so far as they have gone.

Touching on one or two smaller points which the noble Lord, Lord Montagu, mentioned, I would like to point out, as regards the railway in the Khyber, that that policy has already been laid down. The railway is going to be completed, and is progressing. No doubt the noble Earl will be able to give the latest information regarding it. When I left India it was progressing very well. So far, the tribesmen had not shown any great hostility to it, and were accepting the position, in the main, in a most wonderful spirit. I should like to correct one statement that the noble Lord made with regard to the railway to Dusdap. That railway was never planned with any reference to Afghanistan. It was planned in order that we might be able to supply that little force of ours that was at Meshed. Moreover, in the early days the consideration was had in view that, supposing there

was an incursion in the direction of Afghanistan, we might quickly get a force round that way. As the noble Lord knows, the railway goes to the South of Afghanistan, and then takes a turn North into Persia. As regards the railway itself I may say that I have pressed all along that it should go beyond the point which has been mentioned. I should like to see it go over that very rough and desert country as far as Neh. If that were done it would probably have some commercial value. I doubt if it is of any strategical value now, and if we are not able to develop the caravan traffic along that route it may just as well be torn up, and the rails given to the Government of India for use in India.

I do not think there is anything that I can usefully add to what the noble Lord has already told your Lordships with regard to this matter. It is undoubtedly a most important Question, and it might perhaps have been better if it had been discussed on the large side rather than in its details. The whole subject of the frontier policy is one of immense importance. I should not quite take the gloomy view that the noble Lord has done with regard to the present situation, because I think that the forces on the frontier are amply sufficient at the present moment to control the situation, and even if there is any incursion they will be sufficient to deal with it. The House is indebted to the noble Lord for bringing up the subject, and I am glad he has done so.

THE EARL OF LYTTON: My Lords, the Question raised, as every speaker has admitted, is extremely interesting and important. There are, of course, one or two aspects of it which I am debarred from discussing by military reasons, and I am sure the noble Lord will be the first to appreciate this. That applies also to the question of our present Mission to Afghanistan, which is not raised directly by the Question, and on which I am not able to give him at this moment any information. The immense advantage we derive from the presence of Lord Chelmsford in this House and the authoritative speech he has just made relieve me of the necessity of replying to a number of points raised in the debate. I have not the advantage of being personally acquainted with the country and can only give to the noble Lord the information I have obtained from the Department with regard to the points specifically referred to in his Motion.

The noble Lord has divided his Question into two headings, and has asked me what steps, both military and civil, are being taken to provide for the efficient defence of the North-West frontier of India. I will deal first of all with the civil measures which have been taken. The one most directly affecting the problem is that which relates to the provision of the Militia corps and levies recruited from the tribesmen to which Lord Sydenham referred. It is well known, as has been admitted by previous speakers, that when the Afghan incursion of 1919 took place some of our Militia corps, which had done excellent work for many years, in fact ever since the settlement following the last great tribal rising in 1897, failed us, under the stress of hitherto unexampled temptation to join our enemies. Probably too great reliance was placed on these irregular corps, but, be that as it may, some of them, notably the Waziristan Militia and the Zhob levies, proved unequal to the strain. The Khyber Rifles, who were given the chance of taking their discharge before they had committed themselves too far, took advantage of this offer to a large extent. The Kurram Militia and the newly constituted Mohmund Militia, on the other hand, remained steadfast.

As the result of that experience, the policy on this matter has been largely modified. In the plans for the future the local levies and Militia have been to a great extent relieved of the responsibility of offering sufficient resistance to an enemy to allow time for the arrival of Regular Troops. In future, as I shall explain in a moment or two when I come to state the military measures, the covering force, behind which the striking force of the Army is to concentrate, will be composed of Regular Troops, supplemented only by levies and Militia as auxiliaries. The opportunity has therefore been taken to reconstitute these Militia corps, which were dissolved after the fighting of 1919, into units of a less regular nature, and, it is hoped, better adapted to fill the rôle of irregular auxiliaries. They will consist of a Khassadar corps in the Khyber area numbering about 900; a North Waziristan constabulary of a strength of 1,100, or rather less; a South Waziristan constabulary of a similar strength, and Zhob levies which, with the Zhob tribal scouts, will have a strength of about 1,400. Other corps, such as, for example, the Mohmund Militia, remain generally in their former shape.

The Earl of Lytton.

Under the head of civil measures come also the steps that are being taken, and, in some cases (as with the Afridis, except the Zakka Khel), have already been taken successfully, to bring about settlements with the tribesmen along the frontier. Employment in the various levy corps and Militia, and on the works in progress, such as the roads and railways under construction, affords a valuable inducement to good behaviour, but both in the Khyber and Waziristan, it has been found necessary, as Lord Sydenham mentioned, to occupy the country of the tribesmen with military forces. How long this occupation will have to last, and in what strength, it is impossible at this moment to foretell, but the Government of India is determined not to let the present opportunity slip of concluding the best and most enduring settlement it can devise with the tribesmen.

The noble Lord asks me for some information as to the progress of the Khyber railway. The occupation of the Khyber with troops has necessitated the construction of a railway up the Pass in order that the troops may be adequately maintained with all that is necessary, both in peace and war. The railway is a continuation of the standard 5 ft. 6 in. gauge line which has hitherto terminated at Jamrud, and its completion will enable the troops and stores to be railed without trans-shipment or break from any point on the broad gauge system of India to Landi Kotal at the summit of the Khyber, where, on a wide elevated plain, there are facilities for the concentration of a considerable number of troops. The necessity for this railway was brought home to us in the operations of 1919, when, as a makeshift, an elevated wire ropeway was erected for the transportation of stores. This ropeway is still working, and will, no doubt, continue to do good service until the railway is completed. At present earth work is in hand and making good progress along most of the alignment; culverts and retaining walls are in hand and some 400 feet of tunnelling has been accomplished. In addition to this a great deal of work in connection with camps and quarters for the construction *personnel* has been done, but apart from construction sidings at Jamrud, the stage of laying rails has not yet been reached.

Now I come to the military measures on which the noble Lord also asks for information. The more purely military steps that are being taken to provide for the efficient

defence of the North-West frontier may be summarised under two general heads—namely, (1) the provision and organisation of forces suitable for dealing with our possible enemies on the frontier, and (2) the improvement of communication along the frontier. As regards the former, the Army available for operations on the frontier consists, in the first place, of a covering force along the frontier of sufficient strength to maintain its advanced position and to hold off hostile attacks until there has been time to mobilise and concentrate in its required positions the second main portion of the Army, the striking force, composed of Air Forces and of all arms, organised into brigades, divisions and Army troops, suitable for operating in the mountainous terrain of the frontier.

For the reasons I have mentioned I cannot give any precise particulars as to the strength, composition, and exact disposition of these forces. I may, however, mention that their relative strengths are liable to vary according to circumstances. For instance, under favourable conditions, it might be possible to increase the striking force by releasing some of the troops which have to be locked up in the advanced positions allotted to the covering force when conditions are disturbed on the frontier; the guiding principle being that sufficient time should be afforded to the brigades and divisions of the striking force to mobilise and move into their positions undisturbed.

The composition of both the covering and striking forces has been decided upon with due regard to the character and armament of the enemy it is thought that they are most likely to have to encounter and to the nature of the country. As the noble Lord is well aware, the country on the North-West frontier imposes limitations upon the numbers of men and animals that can be employed in military operations, and, for this reason, the efforts of the military authorities in India have been directed to making the greatest possible use of modern mechanical appliances. Apart from the Air Force, with which India is now well equipped, attention has been directed to the necessity of evolving a type of tank suitable to hot countries and mountainous ground, and to the provision of armoured cars, improved artillery, and, particularly, of pack or mountain howitzers.

Perhaps one of the most important improvements, however, consists in the provision of a very large amount of mech-

anical transport to serve the forces taking the field. It is unnecessary to dwell on the importance of mechanical transport in increasing the efficiency of the Army, but in this case it is perhaps permissible to allude to the immense change brought about by the substitution of lorries capable of carrying heavy loads for many miles a day for slow-moving animal transport of very limited daily range, encumbered with numerous attendants, occupying miles of road space, and with a useful carrying load which diminishes rapidly with the length of the communications and the need for carrying the food of its own animals and drivers. The noble Lord wanted to be assured that this policy of an increase of motor transport was being continued. I can assure him that it is. To enable the continually increasing mechanical transport to be in a state of constant efficiency, extensive workshops have been established at Chaklala, near Rawal Pindi, and an establishment of British and Indian *personnel* for these workshops has been sanctioned. It is hoped to complete this establishment in the course of next autumn and winter.

The subject of mechanical transport leads naturally to that of the roads, upon which my noble friend is so great an expert. I agree entirely with all he has said of the importance of the roads everywhere, but more particularly in this district, and I can assure him that their value is appreciated by the Government of India. The extent to which the roads are being developed is determined solely by financial considerations and the funds available. To begin with the Khyber, the two roads up the Pass were last year reported to be practically completed, with the exception of some of the bridges over nullah beds, so as to take mechanical transport traffic, the width of metalling being sixteen feet. I regret that I have to refer to a number of places which will be meaningless to your Lordships without reference to a map, but the noble Lord, Lord Montagu, is familiar with the district, and perhaps he will be able to follow me. The following further roads were reported at the same time to be either completed or practically completed up to a similar standard, except that in a few cases the width of metalling has been limited to twelve feet:—Nowshera—Malakand Pass—Chakdara; Peshawar—Shabkadar—Abazai; Shabkadar—Michni; Peshawar—Michni; Landi Kotal—Kam Shilman;

Kohat - Thall-Parachinar; and Bannu-Miranshah. All of these are either completed or practically completed. The list is not exhaustive, as work is in progress on other roads as well, though some of those, in the more advanced positions, are designed to take only cart traffic.

In Waziristan work is in progress on a very important series of motor roads which are designed to form one of the most important elements in the pacification of this country. The principal of these roads in Waziristan is the one leading from Murtaza, which is on the 2 ft. 6 in. railway line connecting the Indus at Kalabagh, past Khirgi, to which the same railway has now been extended, near the mouth of the Tank river, and Jandola to Ladha, where the main portion of our forces occupying the Mahsud country are at present cantoned. It is intended ultimately to continue this road to a point in the Tochi Valley, probably near Boya, and then down the valley to Miranshah. Further to the south a road will run from Murtaza, on the 2 ft. 6 in. railway, up the Gomal river to Kajuri Kach, with a cart road continuing to Toi Khula, some ten or twelve miles further up the valley. The completion of these roads, together with the occupation of the country, will, it is hoped, have a pacifying effect on the particularly turbulent tribesmen of this part of the frontier.

Further to the south we come to Quetta as the centre of a road and railway system. It has long been recognised that a serious deficiency in our frontier communications is the lack of either a railway or a motor road connecting the Gomal Valley with the Quetta system, through the Zhob Valley. Lack of funds, however, has hitherto prevented this defect from being remedied. A narrow gauge mineral line, however, runs from Khanai on the standard gauge railway to the chrome mines near Hindu-bagh, and so forms the germ of possible future improved communications. Also the road from Harnai, on the same standard gauge railway, as far as Loralai, a matter of some fifty miles, is being improved to fit it to take mechanical transport.

It has been considered more important to improve the road from Sibi, at the eastern end of the Bolan Pass, to Quetta, in order to afford relief to the portion of the railway on which the steepest gradients occur. This road is being made fit for the passage of motor traffic with 12 inches of metalling. Proposals are also under con-

sideration for the improvement of the road from Quetta to Chaman to fit it for the passage of mechanical transport throughout. Apart from the main improvements in rail and road communications along the frontier, steps have been taken to improve the sidings and trans-shipping and unloading facilities at the various railheads, the principal of which are Dargai, at the foot of the Malakand Pass and at the head of the narrow gauge line from Nowshera; at Jamrud, at the mouth of the Khyber; at Kohat, where the change from the 5 ft. 6 in. to the 2 ft. 6 in. gauge railway occurs; at Thall, at the head of the same narrow gauge line; at Mari-Indus, where trans-shipment occurs across the Indus by steam ferry to another narrow gauge railway starting from Kalabagh on the western bank of the river; at Bannu and at Khirgi, at the head of the two branches of this line.

In connection with the subject of the roads on the frontier and of the mechanical transport whose use they are designed to facilitate, I would like to take this opportunity of acknowledging the great obligation which we are under to the noble Lord, for the invaluable work which he has done in this connection in India, and for the advice which he has given to us on the subject during the last few years. I have given the noble Lord all the information which I have been able to obtain, but I feel that I owe you some apology for having to make a statement which was necessarily very technical, and to refer to places which are unfamiliar to many of your Lordships, but I could not otherwise give to the noble Lord all the information which he required. I hope that my statement may be of more interest when it is read than it could possibly have been to those who have had to listen to it.

LORD MONTAGU OF BEAULIEU: My Lords, I beg to thank the noble Earl for his most interesting reply to my Question, and also to join with him in thanking Lord Chelmsford for his most interesting speech, which, coming from such a source, was a matter of great gratification to us. Lord Chelmsford referred to my being apt to look at things through motor goggles. I suppose it was a perfectly legitimate comment. I will only reply by saying that when you are looking at the North-West frontier, and the equipment of armies, you have to look at those matters through very modern spectacles. It is no good thinking

about bows and arrows. I am glad to hear that the Mahsud country has been taken over definitely, and I hope that it may be an augury of the taking over of other parts of the frontier later on. As regards the question of expenditure on frontier matters, I agree with the noble Lord who said you must cut your coat according to your cloth. The North-West frontier, however, is more important than any other military district in India, and it seems to me that some of the provision utilised in the rest of India might be economised, and more money spent on the frontier. I beg to thank noble Lords who have spoken, and the noble Earl who replied for the India Office for his remarks.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

AFFRAY AT NANKANA SAHEB.

LORD SYDENHAM rose to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether he could give the House information as to the causes and extent of the recent deplorable loss of life at Nankana Saheb. The noble Lord said: My Lords, I think it is important, for two main reasons, that the true facts about the tragedy at Nankana Saheb should be made public. In the first place, the blame for all the heavy loss of life which occurred there has been thrown upon the Government. Mr. Gandhi, directly after the event, went to Nankana Saheb and made a speech in which he deprecated the prosecution of offenders. In other words, he suggested that the law should not take its course, because the only means of preventing these occurrences was to get rid of this Satanic Government. This speech was intended to give a lead to extremists in exploiting the tragedy for political purposes, and it has been perfectly successful.

In April, at a crowded meeting in Beadon Square, Calcutta, a resolution was unanimously passed stating that "such horrible deeds as the Nankana Saheb massacre will not cease so long as the present system of government exists in this country," and that "the massacre could not have taken place if the police and other officials had been true to their duties." There are a number of other Sikh shrines in the Punjab which have been seized by the Akali party, and in the case of the Taran Taran, at least, loss of life occurred. So far as I know, no attempt has been made by the Government of India to reply to the charges to which I have referred, and I am sure that the

noble Earl will deal with this point in his reply to me.

In the second place, the whole incident is another warning of the very violent forces which are always alive in India and ready to assert themselves if it is considered that the power and authority of the Government are weakening. Not long ago we had the very shocking occurrences in Behar and at Katapur, where harmless villagers were murdered and outraged by Hindu mobs at a time when the titular leaders of their communities were engaged in friendly conferences. When I drew attention to these very disgraceful proceedings the then Under-Secretary of State said they were due to the fanaticism of ignorant people of the lower classes. Unfortunately, the inquiries proved that the mobs were led by upper caste Hindus, who had not the excuse of ignorance. Since then serious outbreaks have occurred at Malegaon, in the Bombay Presidency, and on the Bengal coalfields, to which I referred the other day. Details of these grave occurrences, and of their causes, have not yet been made public, and there have been other incidents of the same kind which have never been reported in this country.

Among the 315,000,000 people of India barely 3,000,000 are Sikhs, and yet the slaughter at Nankana Saheb occurred as a result of domestic quarrels among this small sect. It has been stated that between 200 and 300 lives were lost, but, as many bodies were burned immediately, the exact figures will probably never be obtained. At any rate, it seems clear that this sectional quarrel caused the loss of more than half the number of lives sacrificed in suppressing the most dangerous conspiracy since the Mutiny. At the present time it seems the fashion for mobs to shout "Hindu-Musliman ki Jai" on all occasions, but if any one believes that the dangerous antagonisms—racial, religious, sectarian—always latent in India, are passing away, he will be bitterly disappointed. These forces have their roots deep in the long distant past, and nothing but the knowledge that the Government is powerful enough, and determined enough, to suppress them will enable the peace of India to be maintained. We have now had warnings in abundance, and I can only hope that they will be taken to heart. For the reasons I have given I trust that your Lordships will consider that I am justified in asking for information.

THE EARL OF LYTTON : My Lords, the deplorable incident at Nankana Sahib to which the noble Lord has referred was the result of a religious dispute between two sections of the Sikh community. It had no political significance, and the Government were in no way concerned in the matter, except to restore order and take such steps as might be necessary to prevent further bloodshed. They were in no way responsible for the casualties which occurred, and the suggestion that Government officials had any complicity in the matter was a mischievous libel (originating, I think, in Lajpat Rai's paper), which was afterwards withdrawn with apologies, although no doubt the purpose for which it was made—namely, to discredit the Government in the eyes of the Sikhs—had been accomplished before it was withdrawn and the apology made. I am sure that the noble Lord does not think that the Government had any complicity in the matter, but before I give him the information for which he asks I desire to make that perfectly clear.

As my noble friend is aware, the cause of the disputes which have led to affrays among the Sikhs is the declared intention of the Religious Reform Party to obtain control over the management of all Sikh Gurdwaras and shrines. The main complaint of the Reform Party is that under the arrangements countenanced by the Old Sikh or Sanatanist Party, practically all the Sikh Gurdwaras have been for years controlled by Mahants, or resident priests, who had a wide discretion as to the management of the revenues, and were not necessarily Sikhs themselves, being in some cases Hindus. Without attempting to pronounce upon the merits of the disputes, it is safe to say that this is one of those cases in which a party, which takes the reformation of worship as its principle, alleges mismanagement, malversation and general laxity leading to great abuses on the part of the existing guardians of the shrines, while the party in possession regards the malcontents as inspired by a desire for plunder.

The Akali Jathas, bands of volunteers who form the more violent section of the reformers, are reported to include a number of lawless and disorderly persons as well as genuine religious zealots, and their recourse to violent action is perhaps, to some extent, due to the failure some years ago of suits brought in the Civil Courts to dispossess certain Mahants of their shrines.

In November and December last the reforming party seized several shrines at Sialkot and elsewhere, and in January a serious fight took place at Taran Taran, near Amritsar. Unfortunately, non-co-operating agitators induced both parties on that occasion to refrain from giving any evidence to the authorities.

It appears that the Mahant of the shrine at Nankana, which is famous as the reputed birth-place of the Guru Nanak, and is very rich, was much alarmed at the success of the Akali Jathas in other places. On November 27 a band of reformers came to the temple armed with *kirpans* and axes, and a party of Sadhus, friends of the Mahants, prepared to oppose them, but violence was prevented by the tactful action of the police. The Punjab Government, desiring to maintain an attitude of strict religious neutrality, considered that it should be left to the interested parties to move the Courts. If the Mahant had reason to fear violence he could either furnish information to a magistrate and ask that his opponents should be made to give security to keep the peace, or he could apply to the Civil Courts for an injunction to restrain persons carrying weapons from entering the shrine. The authorities were ready to supply police protection to the Mahant. He had, early in January, telegraphed to the Government that there would be a forcible attempt to seize the shrine, but no such attempt was then made, and he does not appear to have taken any step to obtain protection from the Courts.

As the case is *sub judice*, it is impossible to express an opinion on the culpability of different parties for the deplorable events of February 20. But it seems clear that on that day an Akali Jatha of about one hundred men entered the temple soon after daybreak and was fired upon from the roofs of the buildings which surround the courtyard. The assailants then came down and attacked the Akalis with axes and *lathis*: the dead bodies were smeared with kerosene and set on fire. The flames were still burning when the Deputy Commissioner, who was in camp at a village some miles off when he heard of the affray, arrived on the scene. The Sikhs state that 135 persons were killed, and the total may amount to this number, though the latest information in my possession shows that the police were certain of 88 deaths. Troops were at once summoned from Lahore, which is 50 miles away, and they arrived that evening, accompanied by

the Commissioner of the Division. The shrine was taken over by the authorities, but subsequently transferred by the Commissioner to a representative committee of Sikh gentlemen. The Mahant and a retinue of twenty-six Pathans, whom he had recently engaged, were arrested and sent to Lahore, where they are being tried.

General orders were issued on February 22 that when a dispute likely to cause violence arose over any shrine the subject of the dispute was to be temporarily "attached" by the district magistrate, due provision being made for the continuance of customary worship. In several subsequent cases bands which have seized shrines have been ejected by the authorities, and bands wandering about the Province are being dealt with either by disarming at once, if practicable, or by prosecution under the Arms Act. Meanwhile, legislation for amending the law regarding shrines has been prepared, but I understand that the draft Bill has given rise to much diversity of opinion in India.

LORD SYDENHAM: I thank the noble Earl for his very clear statement, which will completely dispose of the charges to which I have referred.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

[From Minutes of May 31, 1921.]

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Second Report from the Committee (with an Appendix) made, and to be printed.

The Evidence taken before the Committee from time to time to be printed, but no copies to be delivered except to members of the Committee and to such other persons as the Committee shall think fit until further order.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

[From Minutes of June 2, 1921.]

GOVERNMENT OF BURMA BILL. [H.L.]

Adjourned debate on the Amendment moved by Lord Sydenham to the Motion that the Bill be now read 2^a, viz.: "to leave out ('now') and add to the end of the Motion ('this day six months')," to be resumed on Wednesday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 7th June, 1921.

INDIAN DIVORCES (VALIDITY) BILL. [H.L.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (THE EARL OF LYTTON): My Lords, this Bill is introduced to deal with a situation which has been created by the judgment of the President of the Divorce Court last March in the case of *Keyes v. Keyes*—a judgment which held that the Indian Courts have no jurisdiction to dissolve marriages between persons not domiciled in India, and that the Indian Legislature has no power to confer jurisdiction on the Courts to dissolve marriages in such cases. Ever since the Divorce Act of 1869 the Indian Courts have, in reliance on that Act, made decrees from time to time, where the parties resident in India at the time of the institution of the proceedings were not actually domiciled there. The validity of these decrees has never been questioned during the last fifty-one years, and they have been held to be valid in many cases in the English Courts. The result is that many decrees of divorce have been granted in perfect good faith, the divorced parties have sometimes re-married, and children have been born of those marriages.

Your Lordships, I am sure, will easily recognise what an extraordinary confusion has been created by this decision, which is, in effect, a declaration that a number of decrees for dissolution of marriage had been made without jurisdiction. I am not, of course, in any way calling in question the propriety of the judgment, but the effect of it is to declare that the law is different from what many people have believed it to be for the last fifty years. Marriages contracted upon the faith of the validity of those decrees are now pronounced illegal; the children of such marriages are declared to be illegitimate, and in many cases the title to property is affected. That is a situation which calls for immediate remedy. This Bill deals only with what has happened in the past, and seeks to validate decrees granted before this legislation, or at any rate in cases where proceedings were started before the passing of this measure. It provides, in fact, that the law so far as it relates to the past shall be what it was always

deemed to be. It does not seek to alter the law as it has now been defined, and does not empower the Indian Courts to grant such divorces in the future. I hope, therefore, that it will be regarded as entirely uncontroversial, and that it may pass through your Lordships' House without delay.

Moved, That the Bill be now read 2^a.—
(*The Earl of Lytton*.)

On Question, Bill read 2^a, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Wednesday, 8th June, 1921.

GOVERNMENT OF BURMA BILL.

[H.L.]

Debate upon the Amendment moved by LORD SYDENHAM to the Motion that the Bill be now read 2^a—namely, to leave out ("now") and to add at the end of the Motion ("this day six months")—*resumed* (according to Order).

LORD SYDENHAM: My Lords, I think it is my duty to withdraw my Amendment formally, but I would ask to be allowed to say a few words on this question. At the end of the last debate I asked the noble Earl whether, "if this Bill went to a Select Committee and that Select Committee altered in any way the form of the Government of Burma Bill, the Committee must accept the form described in this Bill—which is the form of diarchy—or would they have any right to consider or propose any alternative form." The noble Earl did not reply from his seat in the House, but I saw him afterwards in the lobby, and he told me that the Bill would be referred in its entirety to the Committee, that the Committee would have full power to make any proposals that it chose, and that the Secretary of State was prepared, if that were necessary, to withdraw the Bill, and even to substitute another, if that was recommended by the Committee.

When the Committee set to work it found that the Secretary of State, on behalf of His Majesty's Government, had "decided upon the application of the Government of India Act, 1919, to Burma." Therefore, the Committee found its hands tied. It could make no recommendation as regards the principle of the Bill, which

The Earl of Lytton.

is the principle of diarchy. The Committee could deal, therefore, only with details, and propose the appointment of somebody to consider on the spot the necessary details to fill in the Bill. I think the Secretary of State has not treated the House quite fairly in this matter, because the House has now no opportunity of saying whether or not it prefers to apply the diarchical principle to Burma. Probably your Lordships might have wished that that principle should be applied to Burma, but, as the matter now stands, you will not have any chance of expressing your view.

It will be said the principle of diarchy, as applied to India, has proved a success. I have seen that stated. But diarchy is a success in India because it is not operating. The Provincial Governments are working as unified bodies, as if they were under the scheme of the five Lieutenant-Governors, to which the Secretary of State would have nothing to say. Therefore, we cannot at present tell what the effects of this principle of diarchy can be. But in a time not far distant we may see an extremist Minister, with an extreme majority in the Legislative Council behind him, and then, I think, it will be found that all the evils which we pointed out at the time will show themselves. So far as the Bill has been applied to India there have been, from the administrative point of view, three results. First, there has been a great increase of the cost of the Government; secondly, there has been a great increase of the bureaucratic elements of Government in India—which always, of course, coincides with the introduction of democracy—and thirdly, there has been a very serious weakening of the financial control. That is what we are now asked to inflict upon Burma.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: I understand that the noble Lord asks leave to withdraw his Amendment.

LORD SYDENHAM: Yes.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (THE EARL OF LYTTON): My Lords, I waited in case any other member of your Lordships' House had anything to say, because I have a right of reply only on the whole debate. If, however, no other member of the House wishes to speak, I

desire to make one or two very brief remarks before the Motion that the Bill be read a second time is put. Three changes have taken place since this Bill was last before the House in March. We have had further communications from the Government of India, and the Government of Burma, and we have now the advantage of the presence in this country of the late Viceroy, Viscount Chelmsford, who, I am sorry to say, is not in his place this afternoon, but he has been present at the meetings of the Joint Select Committee and has been able to express in person the views of his Government. A White Paper has been issued containing all the correspondence which has passed between the Government of India and ourselves on this subject, and, finally, the Joint Select Committee of both Houses have considered the whole correspondence and have issued their Report.

The result is that whereas in March I was obliged to tell your Lordships there was a difference of opinion on this question between the Government of India and ourselves, that difference is now happily adjusted and all parties are unanimous in recommending Parliament to pass this Bill. That being so, it is not necessary for me to detain you by any further defence of the measure. There is only one thing which, I think, must be said in justification of the action taken by the Secretary of State. No one will deny that political sense in Burma has not hitherto been at all actively aroused, and no one with a knowledge of that country will deny that it is actively aroused at the present moment. There is a disposition in some quarters to attribute this to a somewhat rash experiment in Constitution-making on the part of the Secretary of State. I notice that Lord Sydenham, speaking on the Second Reading of the Bill in March, said—

“The Viceroy and Secretary of State declared their intention of deliberately disturbing the placid, pathetic contentment of the people.”

And he added—

“The result of passing this Bill will undoubtedly be to disturb the people—a singularly happy and contented people—and it will arouse in Burma a corresponding agitation to that which is running through India from one end to the other at the present time.”

I cannot help feeling that that is an extraordinary misreading of history.

If there is unrest and agitation in Burma to-day, as undoubtedly there is, it is due

(D 1441—I.)

to one cause, and one cause only—namely, that Burma was not visited by the Viceroy and Secretary of State and, in consequence, was left out of the Government of India Act. It is the omission of Burma from that Act which has created the agitation and unrest which exist at the present time. This Bill is not going to create, as the noble Lord seems to feel, agitation in Burma; it is, I hope, going to remove the cause of such agitation as exists, and it is for that reason that I commend it to your Lordships.

LORD LAMINGTON: My Lords, I should like to say one word in reference to the remarks just made by the noble Earl, not for the sake of criticism, but for the sake of historical accuracy. He said that all parties are now unanimous in respect of this Bill. They are only unanimous, as I am told by a high authority, because the Government have “queered the pitch” by presenting the Bill which is now before us. No doubt, there has been agitation in Burma for increased self-government, but the Government of Burma had their own measure which had been revised and considered by the Government of India. There is no reason to suppose that the proposals of the Government of Burma would not have perfectly satisfied the Burmese people. It is because of the action of the Secretary of State in presenting this Bill that the agitation in Burma has taken its present form, and the Young Burmese Party will accept this measure and no other. That is, I think, an accurate description of what has taken place, and, therefore, unanimity has been obtained because the Government of India realise that a position has been created which will be satisfied only by the proposals contained in this measure.

On Question, Bill read 2^a, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

INDIAN DIVORCES (VALIDITY) BILL. [H.L.]

House in Committee (according to Order): Bill reported without amendment.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 9th June, 1921.

INDIAN DIVORCES (VALIDITY) BILL. [H.L.]

Read 3^a (according to Order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

[From Minutes of Judicial Sitting,
June 10, 1921.]

GOVERNMENT OF BURMA BILL. [H.L.]

Committee of the Whole House (which stands appointed for Wednesday next) put off to Wednesday, the 22nd instant.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Wednesday, 15th June, 1921.

SUBVERSIVE PROPAGANDA.

LORD SYDENHAM had given Notice to draw attention to the effects of organised propaganda in this country, and to ask His Majesty's Government whether there are adequate legal powers to enable the introduction of foreign money, or the import and sale of foreign goods, for the purposes of subversive propaganda to be treated as a criminal offence and if not, whether the necessary legislation will be undertaken.

The noble Lord said : My Lords, I imagine that the earliest propagandist of evil was the serpent in the Garden of Eden, and though his sphere of operations was limited he was more subtle than all the beasts of the field, and his success was catastrophic. This type of the serpent has been persistent ever since all through history, ancient and modern, and you will find traces of propaganda directed to mislead opinion and policy, but for evident reasons the opportunities and scale of operations have increased in recent years. There have been many foreign ambassadors in this country who have carried on propaganda in the interests of their sovereigns, but all this was a bagatelle compared with what Count Bernstorff accomplished at Washington before and during the war, which has not yet been wholly revealed. The fact is that the opportunities and powers of evil now have been enormously increased. If one compares the methods of Peter the Hermit in the years 1095 and 1096, the same as those now in vogue among the Mullahs on the Indian frontier, with those of the Wolff Bureau throughout the war, one realises what enormous advantages are possessed by the propagandists in these days. Bismarck reduced propaganda to something like a fine art, but his successors have gone far beyond him in subtlety and power for evil.

We must recognise now that propaganda carried on from one country for the ruin of others is a new factor in the modern life of nations which it would be madness to ignore. At the present time the British Empire is the main object of attack, and propaganda in the hands of our enemies is their most powerful weapon. Mrs. Webster, in a book which I regard as the most important contribution to history ever made by a woman, has traced back the project of world revolution for 140 years. Probably it goes beyond that; but what is certain is that its spiritual home is in Germany, that in Germany it is really a "key" industry, kept severely for purposes of export. The non-German peoples have contributed very little to the theories on which world revolution is based, but many of them have suffered cruelly in the attempt to carry these theories into practice.

I think it may be said that the British race has contributed nothing whatever to these theories, but, of course, it has produced its quota of communists, syndicalists and anarchists, imbued with the revolutionary mania and anxious to spread imported doctrines in this country. Before the war the object of Germany was to hamper France and England as much as possible by raising industrial strife in both countries. During the war those efforts were intensified to the last degree, and the results were painfully apparent, as the Duke of Northumberland has pointed out; and they were not confined to the miners, from whom very much was hoped and expected. During the war the Germans achieved one colossal success which really changed the whole course of events and gave them a new and powerful leverage of which they are making use to-day. The despatch of Lenin and Bronstein with large sums of money to Russia, to complete the ruin which Kerensky had begun, was a stroke of first class importance, for which, Ludendorff himself has told us, Germany was responsible. The direct effect of that was to make the issue of the war doubtful, to prolong it, and to cause the loss of millions of lives. The perfect loyalty of the Czar to the Allies and the fine efforts of the Russian Army in the first period of the war were all brought to nothing; and now the secondary effects are those which we are feeling.

The wreckers of Russia know perfectly well that they are doomed unless they can

impose their communist theories on other countries, and especially on the British Empire—unless they can accomplish the project of world revolution. Probably, therefore, the main propagandist efforts are now directed from Moscow, with the co-operation of German and Irish agencies working together in America. Surely we can see at home, and in India, Ireland, Egypt and Palestine, the effects of that propaganda, and elsewhere the same deadly work is being carried on by different methods. I received a letter from New Zealand last week which says :

“There is a very great importation of revolutionary propaganda into the Dominion.”

Both in New Zealand and in Australia there have been special attempts to infect the coal-mining population. At the bottom of all this there must be money, and that is why I have ventured to raise this Question to-day. We know perfectly well that money is being liberally expended here, and the noble Earl the Leader of the House, in one of his Notes to the Bolshevik Government, spoke of—

“an attempt to subsidise a campaign against the British Constitution.”

The presence here for many months of the Russian Commercial Mission has greatly facilitated this attempt.

The second coal strike, following so closely upon the first, has been the greatest disaster that has ever befallen our industries. It is the most obviously political and revolutionary strike that we have ever known. Only after more than nine months was the question of wages allowed to be discussed, and the coal miners have been carefully kept in the dark as regards the wages which they could have obtained by frank negotiations with the coal owners. The plan of the coal strike to be supported by the Triple Alliance was conceived by revolutionaries and inspired and assisted from abroad, and it accords exactly with the project of world revolution. The decision of the miners' executive not to allow the mines to be de-watered would appear idiotic if that had not been their object. This great plan has failed only because the British manual working class have so far always been the despair of the foreign revolutionaries ; but if it had succeeded, as was hoped, and if starvation on a large scale had overtaken our people—the starvation which was arranged carefully in the French Revolution and also

in the Russian Revolution—we cannot tell how far the hungry masses might have gone. But the plan has caused widespread suffering, inflicted a blow upon our industry from which I do not believe it can ever completely recover, and bankrupted the unions themselves. Our sympathies must be, and will be, with the great majority of the working coal miners who, under the iniquitous card vote system, were not allowed to express their opinions, and who are never permitted to have a free and secret ballot.

Does anyone believe that there is not a Communist Red Revolution behind the Sinn Féin movement in Ireland, even if the dupes themselves do not know it ? And can anyone suppose that the rebellion would have lasted so long as it has if there had not been foreign assistance and encouragement behind it ? An Irish Republican Army, living upon the country, would soon have become abhorred by all the people, and the terror existing in Ireland to-day is exactly the same as the terror created in the French Revolution and, more recently, in the Russian Revolution—the terror exercised by the few upon the imagination of the many.

In this country the propaganda for corrupting opinion has mainly been based upon the teachings of Karl Marx. This man, whose real name was Mordecai, was expelled from Germany, and he settled in this country, where he was financed entirely by a German capitalist. As Mrs. Webster has shown, he was a shameless plagiarist and a pan-German agent, who did his best to help to ruin France in 1870, and who hated and despised the British working classes, though he may perhaps have infected a small part of our *intelligentsia*. While he lived here he had no influence, but latterly his writings have become the text-books of the Revolutionary Party in this country, and the utterances of many of our Labour leaders seem to be wholly inspired by them. Only last week Mr. Gosling, who is regarded as a moderate, used the following words :—

“In the struggle between the organised workers and the organised capitalists the war is never at an end.”

That is the precise doctrine of Karl Marx, the doctrine which he stole from the world revolutionaries and embodied in his teaching. Neither he nor they have ever explained what is to happen to the working

classes when capital, as Mr. Hodges expects and hopes, comes crashing to the ground.

It is a remarkable fact that, with very few exceptions, these people have never shown the smallest concern for the welfare of the working-classes whom they have exploited. They demand a class war, though many of them were pacifists when it was a question of defending their country against Germany. What may happen during this war on capital, and what will happen when it ends, are matters that do not interest them in the slightest degree. If Marx originated nothing himself, he learned three great lessons during his stay here and reported them to his fellow conspirators abroad—(1) that world revolution could never be accomplished unless Great Britain were involved; (2) that the British people would never make the revolution themselves, and that they must therefore be helped to make it; and (3) that the revolution must be begun in Ireland, which, as your Lordships know, has happened.

This revolutionary propaganda has most certainly been paid for to a great extent from foreign sources, and it is to foreign agencies that we owe, in a great measure, the grave position in which we find ourselves to-day. May I earnestly press upon the Government that the State has a right to use any means in its power to protect our people against the poison which is being spread with the aid of foreign money? It is admitted that foreign funds are coming into this country, and that foreign agents are at work. The Bolsheviks themselves have stated that £23,000 a month is being spent here, and in another place it was explained by the Under-Secretary of State for the Home Office that lecturers, paid from £5 to £10 a week, were going about the country preaching revolution.

I do not believe those salaries come from British sources. The noble Duke, with very great ability and fearlessness, has exposed what is now going on, and not one word of what he has said has been, or I believe ever will be, refuted. The Irish Draft Treaty with the Bolsheviks which the Government has lately published shows that very close relations have existed for some time between those two revolutionary bodies. Doctor McCartain stated his intention of asking for 50,000 rifles for Ireland, and no doubt he expected to get them. It is now stated that no Treaty exists because no Treaty has been signed.

Lord Sydenham.

No Treaty has been signed—no one ever said that it had—but there is a Treaty between the Bolsheviks and Afghanistan which is distinctly inimical to Great Britain, and that Treaty has been signed.

It may be said that it is useless to legislate, because we cannot find out anything about these funds. That really is not so. We know that some time ago a large number of Chinese bonds were allowed to be sold here. We also know that £75,000 worth of jewellery, mostly stolen from murdered men and women, was sold in London; and we know who received the money. The subsequent distribution of this money could certainly have been ascertained. We know that one London daily paper is claimed by the Bolsheviks as being "our organ," and we know that other publications are now being subsidised. The police know the proceedings of some of the members of the Commercial Mission who made a tour in the north, certainly without any trade objects. Scotland Yard knows much more than that, and if it had been free to follow up its knowledge, I believe that it would not only have detected incoming funds of a suspicious character, but would have traced their ultimate destination. Of course, a much stricter control of immigrants is required than now exists, but it would not be right for me to say anything about that at the present time.

Clearly, the signing of the Trade Agreement with the Bolsheviks has made the operations of foreign propagandists easier. The Agreement contains this very significant condition:

"The Russian Soviet Government refrains from any attempt by military, diplomatic, or any other form of action or propaganda to encourage any of the peoples of Asia in any form of hostile action against British interests, especially in India and the independent State of Afghanistan."

That, curiously leaves out England and Ireland, but there is a further explanation later, and that is—

"It is understood that the term 'conducting any official propaganda' includes the giving by either party of assistance to any propaganda conducted outside its own borders."

That is much more explicit, but I do not think that anyone would trust the murderers of Russia, and meanwhile immense harm has been done by the close connection between the Commercial Mission and some of the revolutionary leaders in this country.

The setting up of the Council of Action was done under Bolshevik advice, and that was a most effective form of propaganda. When Rosenfeld returned from London to Moscow, he stated that "the Council of Action has all the time supported us in the negotiations with Lloyd George." Of course it supported him! He went on to say: "The Council of Action has ordered a strike. The miners' strike which began on October 25 will show that we do not stand alone." In other words, this German revolutionary claimed the existence of an offensive and defensive alliance with the Labour leaders of this country.

What is going on here is repeated in America, where there is an organised propaganda among the immigrants directly they come in. Last autumn a remarkable sermon was preached by Dr. Hillis, a successor of Henry Ward Beecher, at the Plymouth Church, Brooklyn. It contains these words—

"Scarcely have these foreigners landed at the railroad stations than they receive a card published in six languages containing essentially these statements: 'Immigrants, remember that this is a capitalistic Government. Remember it is a dirty and rotten Government, where the capitalist will exploit your life. The only way you can get a job is to join a radical society or union. Join some revolutionary society and help us to overthrow this wicked capitalistic Government.'"

Dr. Hillis went on to say —

"Now what men sow they reap. Sow wheat, you reap sheaves. Sow thistles, you reap thistles. Sow sparks, you reap conflagrations. Sow hatred of this Republic, you reap revolution."

That is very sound doctrine, and I only wish it was more effectively preached here. It is hatred of our Constitution which is now being preached. The *modus operandi* of propaganda, in one of its aspects, was most lucidly explained in a report by the Labour Research Department, published after the railway strike of 1919. That strike is already almost forgotten, although it did untold harm and caused the loss of the lives of quite a considerable number of people. This "Research Department," with the sanction of Unity House, decided to spend £2,000, afterwards reduced to £1,500, per day, on "publicity advertisements." This is a large sum to take from the contributions of working-men who have no voice in the matter. The report explains the astute way in which the Press was handled, and there was one particularly artful appeal to the London clergy, using the name of a

well-known right rev. Prelate. That appeal was not altogether without effect. The propagandists claimed complete success for the manoeuvre, and they said that "before the strike ended the railway men had rallied nine-tenths of the industrial workers to their side." That was the effect of skilful propaganda. It was also pointed out that the Government had been placed in the unhappy position of "a beetle on its back." This report should be studied by everyone who wishes to obtain an insight into the clever manner in which propaganda is carried out.

But the world revolutionary propaganda is even more clever, because it is made to appeal to all classes by concealing from some what it impresses most upon others. Thus, it makes special efforts to capture the religious bodies, some members of which evidently have no idea of whither they are being led. I hope I have not wearied your Lordships in trying to show that this is a most serious matter, fraught with peril to the British Empire. The war on capital, which is the class war proclaimed by Marx and by much earlier world revolutionaries, if successful, would bring ruin on this country, deeper and darker than the ruin which has fallen on Russia, because of the very small food resources which we possess. If the poor Russian workmen are starved in a country which easily fed itself, and a part of Europe besides, what would happen here? War on Christianity is being waged at the same time, by the same persons, and by the same methods, and it is also an integral part of the world revolution. If successful, it would end in the downfall of civilisation and a general relapse of the world into hopeless barbarism.

When I raised this Question some time ago, the noble Earl the Leader of the House said that it was engaging the attention of the Government. Since then a good many arrests have taken place of persons who are making revolutionary speeches, but I have not seen any attempts to stop the application of foreign funds to the corruption of our own good people. Whatever liberty we permit to citizens of British race, surely we have a right to say to foreign revolutionaries: "You shall not have free trade in subversive propaganda, directed to bring about red ruin and the breaking up of the laws in this old country." I beg to ask my Question.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Wednesday, 22nd June, 1921.

GOVERNMENT OF BURMA BILL. [H.L.]

Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee read.

Moved, That the House do now resolve itself into Committee.—(*The Earl of Lytton.*)

LORD ISLINGTON: My Lords, before this Bill goes into Committee I would like, with the indulgence of the House, to take the opportunity of making one or two observations, and addressing one or two questions to my noble friend, with regard to the measure. The Standing Joint Committee, as your Lordships are aware, recommended that the Bill, which has now passed its Second Reading and is about to enter Committee, should be adopted by Parliament, and the Standing Joint Committee then proceeded to recommend certain means for providing procedure best calculated to give effect to the Bill, and thus create a constitutional scheme for Burma. In paragraph (6) of the Committee's Report the Committee stated that they had not sufficient evidence to make any recommendation in regard to the two important aspects of the Bill—namely, the division between the reserved and transferred subjects, and the form of election to be adopted. As your Lordships are aware, these are perhaps the most vital elements of the Constitution. The Committee, therefore, proceeded to recommend that at an early date a Committee should be appointed to proceed to Burma; that there should be included in that Committee a Chairman from this country, and possibly one other member, who possessed Parliamentary knowledge; and that the Committee should be charged with the duty of holding an open Inquiry in Burma both with regard to the franchise and the electoral system to be adopted, and also as to the subjects that are to be administered under the Constitution by Ministers.

I should be glad if my noble friend, the Under-Secretary of State for India, will be good enough to tell me if this recommendation of the Joint Committee is to be adopted by the Government, and, if he is in a position to do so, when the Committee will be appointed, and of whom it is to be composed. I shall also be glad to

hear, if the noble Earl is able to give me the information, that this Committee may be appointed at a very early date. In the Joint Committee we are only recommending to Parliament to follow the course that was adopted in the case of the Government of India Bill. It was found necessary there to appoint a Committee, under the Chairmanship of Lord Southborough, to deal with these subjects, and while it was found important in India to deal with them, I think for many reasons, although not in a similar area, it is more important in Burma, where the conditions vary considerably.

It is also important because the Joint Committee had before them the communications that had passed between the various authorities—the India Office, the Government of India and the Government of Burma—and it appeared clear to the Committee that it would be impossible for them to make any precise recommendations in regard to these important aspects of the scheme, because the communications that were before them were very varied in character, and, indeed, showed a considerable divergence of opinion among those who were considering them. Therefore, it was quite impossible for the Joint Committee to arrive at any definite and precise conclusions in regard to these matters, and they found themselves obliged to urge that a Committee should be appointed, possessing a member, or members, with detached views and with Parliamentary experience; because, after all, we are laying down a Parliamentary system in Burma, and it is very important that officials in Burma should have the assistance of those with Parliamentary experience in this country.

In the event of this Committee being set up, I should be very glad if my noble friend is able to tell me that it will be set up with the greatest possible despatch, so that the work of the Committee may commence at the earliest possible date after this Bill has passed through Parliament, and in accord with the physical conditions in Burma. It is argued by some that the appointment of a Committee like this will unduly delay proceedings, but the Joint Committee were quite satisfied in their own minds, if the Committee gets to work this autumn and deals with the matter in precise fashion, that there is nothing to prevent their Report and recommendations coming back at the earliest date at the

commencement of the session next year, which would enable the Constitution in Burma to come into active operation in the course of the coming year.

There is one further point that I would urge upon my noble friend, which is not actually mentioned, although it is implied, in the Report. It is that he should assure the House, if he can, that no steps will be taken to fetter or prejudice the finding of this local Committee in Burma. Of course, all the available information, all the Despatches, the Report of the Joint Committee, and all the matter in the form of directions which are available should be furnished to the Committee, but, beyond that, I would suggest that the Committee should be left to arrive at its own findings as the result of free and open inquiry in the country. To make quite clear what I mean, I would say that I am very anxious, and I know many of my colleagues on the Joint Committee share my view, that this local Committee should not find themselves in the same position as that in which we found ourselves on the Joint Committee in regard to the Bill. We are very anxious that the Committee should not have the case pre-judged, or prejudiced, by any announcement by authority in India dealing with the subject matter which would properly come under their consideration. I say this because I feel that if such an announcement were made it would inevitably deprive the Committee of much of its usefulness.

I think that Burma should be afforded the same advantages, to ensure its having a sound Constitution with all the practical details thoroughly considered before that Constitution is put into operation, as, under Lord Southborough's Committee, India was assured last year. I am sure that Burma will appreciate that point of view when it is represented to it. It is merely to ask those questions that I have risen, and I shall be grateful to my noble friend if he can assure me on those points.

LORD CLWYD: My Lords, I fully endorse all that my noble friend Lord Islington has said, both as to the necessity of passing this Bill without delay and as to the necessity of appointing a Committee, as has been recommended by the Joint Committee, to inquire into details on the spot, and to make as early a Report to the Joint Committee and to Parliament as is possible, with reference to the suggested

new scheme of self-government in Burma. It is most important, in my judgment, that that Committee should be so constituted as to command the general confidence of all Parties in Burma.

There is only one other suggestion which I should like to make for my noble friend on a point of detail in regard to the Bill. There is a proviso in the Bill which enacts that the percentage of elected representatives on the Legislative Council to be set up in Burma is to be 60 per cent. of the total number. In India, as the House will remember, the percentage is 70 per cent. There were, undoubtedly, certain circumstances in the case of Burma which, I suppose, were in the minds of the Government when they decided that the percentage in Burma should be lower than that in India. I should like to ask the noble Earl whether, having regard to the present position of affairs, it is not possible for the Government at all events to consider the omission of that proviso. I notice that the noble Earl has an Amendment on the Paper designed to make it absolutely clear that this percentage is a minimum percentage. That, so far as it goes, will, I think, clear the air and make the position what it should be, so far as Burma is concerned. But, if it had been possible to pass the Bill without the proviso, I think, upon certain grounds, it would have been advisable to do so. I will not detain the House further on these points to-day, but I am glad to believe that this Bill will pass without delay.

LORD SYDENHAM: My Lords, the proceedings and the action of the Secretary of State and of the Government of India in this matter have really been somewhat extraordinary. The noble Earl will remember, I am sure, that he told me that the Secretary of State had determined to refer the Bill to the discretion of the Committee. He even went so far as to say that the Secretary of State would withdraw the Bill, or would amend the Bill, if the Committee so recommended. But the Secretary of State seemed to have changed his mind, and he informed the Joint Select Committee that the Government had decided to apply the Government of India Act to Burma as it stood. Of course, the Secretary of State had a perfect right to do that, and he might even have dealt with Burma, if he chose, without any reference to Parliament at all. But, having set up the Joint Committee, and the Joint

Committee having sat a good many times and done a great deal of work, surely it might have been allowed some discretion in the matter of the Bill, as was evidently at one time intended.

Turning to the Government of India, they first agreed that another and a special scheme should be applied to Burma, on the ground that Burma was not at present ripe for the application of the Government of India Act. That special scheme, which they blessed and agreed to, was the outcome of a great deal of discussion in India. Then the Government of India seems to have changed its mind and said that the Government of India Act must be applied to Burma. That left the Joint Committee with nothing at its discretion, except certain details as to the franchise and the composition of the two Houses. All that the Joint Committee could do, therefore, was to propose that a particular machinery should be set up in order to settle on the spot the nature of those details.

But the Government of India seems to have changed its mind once more, and it now demands that its proposals—which are a different set of proposals—should be announced and made public at once. The only explanation that one can arrive at as to this change of attitude is that the Government of India was really alarmed at the violence of the agitation set up in Burma. As I think your Lordships know, what happened in Burma was that the body that there corresponds with our Young Men's Christian Association was captured by extremists from India, and proceeded to set up a very violent agitation. Everyone who knows anything of the East must be aware that if you show fear you always add enormously to the number of your enemies, and that is what has happened in India itself. The noble Earl took me rather severely to task for something I said in the first debate on this subject, and he stated his belief that the only cause of the agitation in Burma was that the Burmese were excluded from the operations of the Government of India Act; and he added that this Bill would remove all the sources of agitation in Burma itself. I earnestly trust that he is right in that hope, but he must remember that the passage of the Government of India Act intensified the agitation throughout India, and made it distinctly more dangerous than it was before. The non-co-operation movement,

Lord Sydenham.

which, as I have pointed out, must fail in certain aspects but will leave behind it an aftermath of evil from which India will never wholly recover, was set up and developed after the passage of the Government of India Act.

I can only say again that I think that Burma is not fit at present for the application of the Government of India Act. And I must point out that the Government of India at one time took that view itself. I therefore regard this legislation as something in the nature of panic legislation, and I fear that it may produce in what was, quite a short time ago, certainly the happiest and the most contented Province of India, some of the disorganisation which we can now painfully see in India itself. At least, it is certain—and perhaps that is the only thing that is certain—that the application of this Bill to Burma will greatly increase the cost of Government in that country, and must therefore reduce *pro tanto* the funds which are available for the amelioration of the condition of the inarticulate masses of Burma.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (THE EARL OF LYTTON): My Lords, you will not, I think, expect me at this stage to enter once more into a defence of the principles of the Bill which is now under discussion. My noble friend Lord Sydenham is, as we are all aware, a determined and convinced and, I am afraid, irreconcilable, opponent of the principle of diarchy, and it was only natural that he should oppose the extension of that principle to any other part of the world. The Bill, however, has received a Second Reading, and it has been considered by a Joint Committee of both Houses of Parliament. I propose at this moment to deal only with the specific points raised on the Motion to go into Committee and to answer the questions which have been put to me.

My noble friend Lord Islington was anxious, I think, to know whether it was the intention of the Secretary of State to appoint a Committee, as was suggested in the Report of the Joint Select Committee, to investigate the problems and the functions of Government and the incidence of the franchise in Burma. On that point I can, I hope, completely satisfy him. As I announced, I think, on the first Motion for the Second Reading of the Bill, it has always been the intention of the Govern-

ment, if this Bill was passed, to appoint a Committee to fulfil in Burma the same functions as were performed by the Southborough Committee in India in relation to the Government of India Act. As has already been announced it is the intention, therefore, of the Secretary of State to appoint a Committee, and he hopes that Committee will begin its work at the earliest possible date after the passing of the Bill.

Next, my noble friend asked me some questions in regard to the composition of that Committee. We have had telegraphic correspondence with the Government of India on this question, and they have urged upon the Secretary of State the desirability of appointing Mr. Whyte, who is now the President of the Legislative Assembly in India, as the Chairman of this Committee. That recommendation the Secretary of State is disposed to approve, and he feels that it would be difficult to find anybody with better qualifications for the post than Mr. Whyte. That gentleman distinctly fulfils the qualifications suggested by my noble friend. He has long experience of Parliamentary life in this country. He was a Member of Parliament, I think, for something like eight years, and it was because of his well-known Parliamentary experience that he was chosen to fill the responsible post of the first President of the first Legislative Assembly in India under the new Act. From the point of view, therefore, of Parliamentary experience his qualifications are very adequate.

Then he has a qualification which nobody else could possibly have—he has been the President of the Legislative Chamber in India throughout its first session. His appointment to that office has added to his past distinction, and he has fulfilled it with such universal satisfaction, so far as we are able to learn in India, that I hope your Lordships will agree that a man so qualified is as good a choice as we could make to undertake this work. I should say also, in connection with this appointment, that it has the added advantage that Mr. Whyte, being now in India, will be ready to take up the duties of investigation more promptly than anybody could who was sent from this country. Whether it is desirable to send out to assist him some other member of the Committee with Parliamentary experience in this country is a matter on which the Secretary of State has not finally decided. It is, however,

his intention to set up a Committee. He hopes that Mr. Whyte will be the Chairman of the Committee. The further composition of it is at this moment under consideration, and I cannot tell the House how it will be composed, but I can assure my noble friend behind me (Lord Clwyd) that every effort will be made to ensure that its membership shall be of a character to command confidence in Burma, in India, and in this country.

I come now to the last point raised by my noble friend, Lord Islington, when he expressed the hope that no steps would be taken to prejudice in any way, in advance, the findings of the Committee, and I think Lord Sydenham was dealing with the same point when he also expressed the hope that no views either of the Government of Burma or the Government of India should be published on these two questions which the Committee would investigate, previous to their undertaking their Inquiry.

I must say something at this point in reply to my noble friend, Lord Sydenham, on the charge which he has made more than once that the Committee of which he was a member, and of which my noble friend Lord Islington was Chairman, have not been treated fairly in their investigations on this Bill. He said, and said quite rightly, that when I asked the House to appoint a Joint Committee and to refer this Bill to them, that Committee were to be perfectly free to consider the whole policy of the future government of Burma and to make what representations they thought fit to Parliament. My noble friend said that after having given that assurance the Secretary of State appears to have changed his mind, and to have assured the Committee that the matter was already decided and that it was not for them to consider.

I confess that I am completely at a loss to understand to what my noble friend refers, because, so far as I am aware, there has been no change of mind, and no change of policy, on the part of the Secretary of State. It always was his intention that the Committee should have perfect liberty and discretion in considering the matter which was referred to them. He, no doubt, told the Committee what I told your Lordships in this House—that His Majesty's Government had decided, according to their judgment, to apply the Government of India Act to Burma; that it was for this purpose that this Bill was introduced, and that the Bill represented the policy of His

Majesty's Government. But I also stated, in submitting the policy of the Government to the House, that in view of the difference of opinion existing between ourselves and the Government of India, we wished to refer our policy which was in the Bill, and the proposals of the Government of India which were in the White Paper, to a Committee of Parliament, and to ask them to consider the questions at issue between us.

Then, as my noble friend knows, by the time the matter came before the Committee the Government of India, as he says, changed its mind. At the time the matter came before the Select Committee the Government of India expressed the opinion that in view of the policy announced in the Bill by His Majesty's Government, they were not prepared to recommend to Parliament any other course. They thought that Parliament would be well advised in passing the Bill which His Majesty's Government had submitted. I do not see how the Government could possibly have submitted the question to the consideration of the Select Committee without introducing a Bill and taking the course which they did take. There is no doubt that the fact that the Government had embodied its policy in a Bill had its effect upon public opinion in Burma, but that did not in any way fetter the discretion of the Committee, and if they thought that His Majesty's Government had made a mistake and that any other policy was more desirable, it would have been perfectly open for them to make what recommendations they pleased.

In this connection, however, I agree with my noble friend, Lord Islington, that when a Committee has been set up to investigate these two problems of the functions of Government and the incidence of the franchise, it would not be desirable that the views of the Government of Burma, or the Government of India, or any other authoritative body, should be communicated to the public before they are communicated to the Committee. It is our intention that those proposals—of which my noble friend is aware, because they were referred to his Committee—shall in due course be referred as evidence to the Committee which will be set up to investigate these two matters. It is not our intention, before the Committee begins its work, to make any public pronouncement on the subject. I think that I have now covered all the points that were raised with

The Earl of Lytton.

the exception of that mentioned recently by the noble Marquess, Lord Crewe, to which I will refer when I come to move an Amendment in a moment.

THE EARL OF MIDLETON: My Lords, I should like to ask one question. I was not fortunate enough to be present during the first portion of the remarks of the noble Earl. It seems to me that it is no use going back on the fact that this Bill was introduced before the Committee was formed, and that, therefore, the policy was practically settled before the Committee could go into the matter. The question I wish to put is this. If the Bill is passed, are we to understand that the noble Earl objects, on behalf of the Government, to the sending out of a Commission to consider on what terms the Bill should be put into operation? I know it is admitted that there is an arrangement in Burma on somewhat similar lines to those which obtain in the Provinces of India, but does the noble Earl accept the view, which is strongly advocated by the Committee, that the matter should not be settled here, but that further investigation should take place on the spot?

THE EARL OF LYTTON: Certainly. If the noble Earl had been in the House he would have heard that I announced the decision of the Secretary of State to appoint a Committee, which would be presided over by Mr. Whyte, who is a President of the Legislative Assembly in India, and that the question of whether other members should be sent out from this country was still occupying his attention.

EARL BUXTON: My Lords, in reference to what has fallen from the noble Earl, the Under-Secretary, I would like to have made clear the last point with which he dealt. I understand that the opinion of the Joint Committee, of which I am a member, is that there is no objection to the appointment of Mr. Whyte as Chairman of the Committee, but the Committee attach immense importance—as, I am sure, my noble friend, the Chairman of the Committee, appreciates, and I should like my noble friend, the Under-Secretary, to appreciate also—to the fact that this Commission should go out without any information having been made public by the Government of India or by the Secretary of State here. The Committee desire that their proceedings shall be entirely independent of the views held either here or in

India. The noble Earl, as I understood him, said that that also was his view to a certain extent, and that the Committee would, in the first instance at all events, meet without any publication being made in regard to the views of the Government, or of the Viceroy and his Council in India.

A little later, the noble Earl, as I understood him, went on to say that the views of the Indian Government would be put forward in the nature of evidence. Does that mean that they propose to put before this Commission a particular scheme of their own, or will they simply give evidence in regard to the various points which arise? As a member of the Committee I think we should attach considerable importance to evidence given in regard to the various points, but we should not wish it to be put in the form of a detailed scheme, because, in our opinion, that would greatly prejudice the Committee's opportunities and attitude, and limit the amount of freedom which they ought to have for considering the matter. I should like the noble Earl to make it clear that what he is proposing is that they should give evidence on the various points which arise, and not that they themselves should put before the Commission a cut-and-dried scheme. If that were done, it would put the Commission in a difficult position when they had to consider the matter impartially.

THE EARL OF LYTTON: My Lords, I find it a little difficult to follow the noble Earl on this point. I think I made it clear that no proposals of the Government of Burma will be published before the Committee begins its work. He will not, however, I imagine, deny the right of the Government of Burma to have an opinion as to what the solution should be. As he knows, the Government of Burma have already expressed their views as to what they think the arrangement with regard to the functions of Government should be, because those views have been submitted to the Committee, of which the noble Lord is a member. Those views will, of course, be put before the Commission in Burma when it opens its Inquiry, and they will undoubtedly be put by the Government of Burma as their views and as representing their considered opinion. It would be impossible to deny to the Government of Burma the right to do that. That such views will carry weight with the Committee I have no doubt, but the mere fact that the Committee is appointed to consider such views means that

the Committee will have full authority and absolute discretion to accept the views of the Government of Burma, or to reject them, and to report to Parliament in their favour or in opposition to them. It would, of course, be impossible to prevent the Government of Burma from having views and submitting them to the Committee. All I intended to say was that whatever the considered opinions of the Government of Burma or the Government of India might be, they would be submitted in due course to the Committee as evidence, and would not be published in advance as the opinions of the Government.

On Question, Motion agreed to.

House in Committee accordingly.

[The EARL OF DONOUGHMORE in the Chair.]

Clause 1:

Application to Burma of provisions as to governors' provinces.

1.—(1) Section forty-six of the Government of India Act (which makes provision as to the mode of government in governors' provinces) shall have effect as though Burma were included amongst the provinces specified in subsection (1) thereof, and all the provisions of that Act which relate to governors' provinces shall apply to the province of Burma accordingly:

Provided that—

(a) subsection (2) of section seventy-two A of that Act (which relates amongst other things to the proportion of elected members in the governors' legislative councils) shall, in its application to Burma, have effect as though sixty per cent. were substituted for seventy per cent.; and

the number of members of the Legislative Council of Burma shall be ninety-two, and the First Schedule to the Government of India Act shall have effect accordingly; and

(c) The maximum annual salary of the Governor of Burma shall be one hundred thousand rupees, and the maximum annual salary of the members of the Executive Council of the Governor of Burma shall be forty-eight thousand rupees, and the Second Schedule to the Government of India Act shall have effect accordingly.

(2) Subsection (1) of section fifty-three of the Government of India Act is hereby repealed.

THE EARL OF LYTTON moved, in proviso (a) of subsection (1), to leave out "proportion" and insert "minimum percentage." The noble Earl said: The first two Amendments that stand in my name are purely drafting Amendments, but I wish to say a few words in explanation

of why they have been put down. They do not in any way alter the sense of the Bill, but have been put down to make the meaning of the Bill absolutely clear. In correspondence which we have had with the Government of India and the Government of Burma, it has been made evident that the sense of these provisos is not quite clearly understood. Proviso (a) lays down what, in the draft before your Lordships, is called a proportion of the elected members and it has been thought that that was an absolute number of the proportion between the nominated and elected members. It was, however, really intended that this proportion should be only a minimum percentage. It is open to the Committee, of which we have been speaking, if they so desire, to recommend different proportions. Therefore, I beg to move the Amendment, which will make it perfectly clear that the word "proportion" is really a minimum percentage.

Amendment moved—

Page 1, line 16, leave out ("proportion") and insert ("minimum percentage").—(*The Earl of Lytton.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE EARL OF LYTTON moved, at the beginning of proviso (b), after (b), to insert "subject to the provisions of the said subsection (2) as amended by this section." The noble Earl said: This is an Amendment of the same kind. Proviso (b) was intended to make an insertion in the Schedule to the Government of India Act with regard to the number of Legislative Councillors. It has been assumed by those who have read this Bill that the insertion of this proviso fixes for all time the number of Legislative Councillors in Burma at 92. That, however, is not so. In the case of Burma, as in that of other Provinces in India, it will be open to Parliament, by Rules on the recommendation of the Committee, to increase those numbers to any extent. All that the insertion of these figures will mean is that the minimum number will become 92, and the Amendment I propose makes it perfectly clear that the insertion of these figures in the Schedule to the Government of India Act will have the same effect as it has in the case of other provinces.

Amendment moved—

Page 1, line 21, after ("(b)") insert ("subject to the provisions of the said subsection (2) as amended by this section").—(*The Earl of Lytton.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Earl of Lytton.

THE EARL OF LYTTON moved in proviso (c), to substitute "sixty thousand rupees" for "forty-eight thousand rupees." The noble Earl said: This Amendment is of a different character. It increases the maximum salary provided for in the Bill for the Members of the Executive Council. It is brought forward because the figure of 48,000 rupees at present in the Bill, or 4,000 rupees a month, is a relic of the original scheme. The Bill will probably provide for two Executive Councillors and two Ministers, and the pay of the Minister is regulated by that of the Executive Council. In India the pay of the Executive Councillors in the Punjab and Bihar and Orissa is that which I propose to make it by the Amendment—namely, 60,000 rupees. In the three Presidencies and the United Provinces it is a higher figure, and in Assam a lower figure. It is in order to make the pay of the Executive Councillors in Burma correspond to that of the Executive Councillors in the Punjab that the Amendment is moved.

Amendment moved—

Clause 1, page 2, line 5, leave out ("forty-eight") and insert ("sixty").—(*The Earl of Lytton.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

Remaining clause agreed to.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 23rd June, 1921.

GOVERNMENT OF BURMA BILL. [H.L.]

Amendments reported (according to Order).

BRITISH MANDATES.

LORD ISLINGTON: My Lords, one further word in regard to the whole situation in Central and East Africa. Our possessions in East and Central Africa, quite apart from Tanganyika, demand to-day the very earnest attention of the Government. There are many and most urgent problems requiring immediate adjustment. There is the question of the political and economic *status* of the Indian community in these countries. They are suffering unquestioned disabilities, and their grievances are being ventilated both

in India and throughout these countries. There is also the question of the native communities, giving rise to serious apprehension among some responsible bodies of opinion, both as regards the conditions, to-day prevailing, of labour imposed upon native communities, and as regards the treatment meted out to them with respect to the reservation of their land. I mention the problems in our own Crown Colonies of Kenya, and in a less degree in Uganda, and in the country of Zanzibar, where we have responsibilities, because I venture to say it will be impossible now to separate them from similar problems which must prevail in Tanganyika. I am sure that it will be found, in dealing with these problems, that the whole area must be taken into account, whether Mandated country or Crown Colony, especially in that particular zone. This is a very important question upon which I shall not this evening do more than touch. All I desire to say is that the redress and adjustment of these grievances, and the permanent settlement of these problems, which really are a world-wide concern in our position as a great Empire, are, first and foremost, functions which the Imperial Parliament must deal with, and no other body outside.

I venture to ask the noble Duke whether he will convey to the Secretary of State an invitation from me that, before the end of this session, he should give a very full statement in another place of the present and future administration of these territories, which now come under his control. I would further urge upon him, in the strongest terms, that if these complex, and in many respects acutely controversial, problems are to find solutions at his hands, I am confident it will not be through the instrument of a mere Departmental conference in this country. I believe that it can only be done successfully, and to the actual acceptance of the contending parties in those countries, by the appointment of a strong and impartial Royal Commission, which should be sent out to those countries this winter, with a specific reference to inquire into, and report to Parliament on, the whole subject.

These are the main Questions which I desire to ask. I have added to my Question a Motion that a Return should be granted to Parliament of the military expenditure in those countries since they have come under the Mandate. The noble Duke may tell me that it is difficult for him to give a

precise Return in that connection, but in view of the fact that we really know so little of what has been done in those countries, not since they became Mandated but since the Armistice, and in view of the fact that in some of them we know there have been military garrisons, I think it will be to the advantage of Parliament that we should be informed as to the precise expenditure in that connection that has been involved by our military occupation. I shall be very much obliged to the noble Duke if he will give me an answer. I beg to move.

LORD SYDENHAM: My Lords, the questions which have been raised in regard to this matter this afternoon are of extreme importance. A limited financial explanation has been given in another place by the Secretary of State, and the other House has received a good deal of information which has reached this House only through the medium of the public Press. There has also been a debate of a somewhat inconclusive and not very searching character in another place, whereas it may be impossible to raise a similar debate in this House. My noble friend has spoken of the Mandates which have not yet received Parliamentary sanction but which now appear, as I understand the matter, to be under the consideration of the Council of the League of Nations. Those Mandates entail responsibilities and unknown expenditure upon this country. On the other hand, they may be said, in a certain sense, to destroy the sovereign rights of the Mandatory Power and to set up what may almost amount to international control over territories in which the responsibility for maintaining order will fall wholly upon this country.

I must not discuss the Mandates at length to-day, but there are one or two points to which I desire to draw the attention of your Lordships, because I am not sure that they are realised even by the noble and learned Lord who has spoken this afternoon. In Mesopotamia, under Article 1, all is made to depend upon what is called "the Organic Law," which Organic Law, it is laid down, must contain provisions to facilitate the progressive development of Mesopotamia as an independent State. I suppose what is called the Organic Law is the Constitution which we are about to set up. We have seen the results of attempts at constitutional government in

Persia, and they have certainly not proved very hopeful hitherto, though the conditions there are not dissimilar from those in Mesopotamia. Whatever government is set up in Mesopotamia will tumble to pieces absolutely unless British forces stand behind it. Those forces must be paid for entirely by this country, and no one at this stage can estimate what the cost will be.

In Article 2 what is called the Mesopotamian Government may or may not, as it pleases, contribute to the cost of the forces necessary to defend the country. Are we going to control that Government in its financial character, or are we not? If not, the time may come when that Government will refuse to bear the expenditure for its own defence. Generally speaking, the Mandates are so drawn as to prevent a Mandatory Power from getting any special advantage to compensate for very heavy responsibilities, danger in some cases, and in all cases an unknown expenditure. Individual citizens of every Member State of the League of Nations and any company registered under the laws of such State have apparently just the same rights as citizens and corporations of the Mandatory Power. If I have read it aright, that seems to me to be intolerable, and it would be interesting to know whether the French Mandates have the same provision as that, or whether our friends across the Channel have given rather closer regard to their interests than we have given to ours.

The Secretary of State has said that the garrison of Mesopotamia is to be reduced after October 1 to what he calls the "twelve-battalion scale." But neither he nor anybody else can tell whether that scale will prove to be sufficient. His plan, as he outlined it, is that the river from Basra to Baghdad is to be held by troops, and from Baghdad to Mosul is apparently to be controlled by air forces, and the Kurds, as the noble Lord has said, because they will not submit to any form of Arab government, are to be governed direct by the High Commissioner. Then an Arab Army is to be created, which will take some time, and will require from us some of our best men, urgently needed at this time by India, who, unfortunately, are not going to India. I cannot attempt to deal with all these various plans, but surely, as previous speakers have said, they ought to be fully discussed in your Lordships' House.

Lord Sydenham.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 28th June, 1921.

GOVERNMENT OF BURMA BILL. [H.L.]

Read 3^a (according to Order).

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (THE EARL OF CRAWFORD): My Lords, this is essentially a Money Bill and in order to safeguard "privilege" it is necessary to move a privilege Amendment. It is, of course, anticipated that the Amendment will not remain in the Bill and that the measure will pass in the terms in which it is now before us. I beg to move that the privilege Amendment be made.

Moved accordingly, and on Question, Amendment agreed to.

Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

[*From Minutes of June 29, 1921.*]

INDIAN DIVORCES (VALIDITY) BILL. [H.L.]

Returned from the Commons, agreed to.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, 1st July, 1921.

ROYAL COMMISSION.

The Royal Assent was given to the following Bill—

Indian Divorces (Validity).

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 7th July, 1921.

SITUATION IN INDIA.

LORD SYDENHAM rose to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether he can state what steps the Government of India is taking to protect the lives and property of Europeans and loyal Indians in country districts where anxiety prevails. The noble Lord said: My Lords the Council of the European Association at

Calcutta has lately addressed the Government of Bengal, drawing attention to what it calls the "feeling of insecurity existing among Europeans," and it has begged the Government of Bengal that "steps be taken to protect the lives and property of law-abiding Europeans and loyal Indians, and so establish law and order that boycott by intimidation may become impossible." The immediate cause of that very strong appeal was that Gandhi's agents were travelling all over the division of Chittagong and endeavouring to incite hatred and contempt of Europeans among Indians. The European Association stated its belief that this propaganda work has taken place with the knowledge of the Government and that the Government was reluctant to do anything which might be misrepresented as repression, for fear of prejudicing the success of the recent reforms.

The European Association is certainly not an alarmist body. On the contrary, I think it was extraordinarily slow in realising what the inevitable effects of the policy and the methods of the Secretary of State must be, of the results of which this House received plain warnings, but which have developed much more rapidly than even the greatest pessimist among us expected at the time. I therefore beg your Lordships to believe that the Association did not make this strong appeal without more than adequate reasons, and it is those reasons which induced me to put down the Question which I ask this afternoon.

India is so vast that you cannot possibly form a really true opinion of the situation in India as a whole at any time, and the public here never hears a fraction of what is happening in the country districts. In the large towns, when a riot occurs, we are immediately informed of it, and also of the number of casualties. We have two such reports, and very serious reports, to-day, from Aligarh and Madras, but in some of the country districts there has been quite a considerable loss of Indian lives, and we in this country have never known that it had occurred. The unhappy residents of Chittagong have lately described the position in which they now find themselves, and they say this :—

"The trade of the place has come to a standstill, and foodstuffs are selling in the bazaar at famine prices. The banks are doing no business, and co-operators with the Government live in daily terror of assaults. The town is picketed with

non-co-operators, and law-abiding citizens are prevented from attending to their daily work by constant abuse, intimidation, and threats of violence to their womenfolk. This is called non-violent non-co-operation."

That is a picture of flagrant lawlessness, and the residents ask: "When will Chittagong be reconquered by the British Government?"

And precisely the same conditions as those prevail in other parts of India. A European writes from Tippera :—

"Not a bungalow here has a servant, and we are having to cook our own food. The bazaar people will not sell us food unless we pay double the price a native pays."

For an Englishwoman to have to cook in the heat of India is really a most serious hardship. Your Lordships are aware of what has happened in many of the tea gardens of Assam and Bihar, where the poor, ignorant coolies have been induced to trek to the railway stations, abandoning or selling at absurd prices all their small possessions. At the stations they squatted without any food, and at length the Government provided them with passes to their native villages, where, of course, they will find themselves absolutely stranded. Cholera broke out among them, and between 300 and 400 of them have already died, while the survivors will spread the disease to the villages where they have already gone. The idea of these senseless and cruel proceedings—which are exactly the same as those which Gandhi tried and carried out in Natal some years ago—is, of course, to destroy the tea industry, which we have built up to the very great advantage of India.

One object of Gandhi's movement is to obtain control of the domestic servants, so as to be able to withdraw them whenever he chooses. In some cases this has been accomplished, and the position of our countrymen and countrywomen is becoming almost impossible. The European in India, as any of your Lordships who have been there must know, is absolutely dependent upon his servants, and during the Mutiny there were numerous touching instances of the lives of our people being saved by the devotion of their servants at the risk of their own lives. Gandhi is making great efforts to induce the domestic servants to hate their employers, and to leave them helpless whenever he chooses to give the word of command.

There are also parts of India now where the position of Europeans is becoming almost intolerable. Our women dare not go out without escorts, and they are obliged to have arms constantly by their side. Most officials and non-officials are liable in many cases to insult in open day, while in parts, where a few years ago you could go in perfect freedom, life is no longer safe. Almost the only places in which the European now enjoys freedom from insult are the Native States, where the chiefs have declined to give up their authority. In some parts of India the district officers can no longer tour because they are deprived of supplies, and they are therefore cut off from their people, with the object of rendering them contemptible in the eyes of their people, whom they have been helping to rule. In Rangoon, as a result of the Caliphate agitation, the municipal engineer was dragged out of his car, and his face was smeared with mud. The Burmans have no more to do with the Caliphate question than the Tibetans have to do with Irish Home Rule, but the great artificial agitation which has been set up in Burma, being carried there from India, has so much alarmed the Government of India that, as I said the other day, it suddenly changed its mind and demanded the instant application of the Government of India Act to Burma.

The recent outbreak at Rajshahi gaol was preceded by reports that Gandhi was going to pay a visit, and that British rule had ceased. The Government of Bengal reported on this very serious incident, and they said the situation was saved by the European district officers, who displayed "conspicuous energy, resource and activity." Within a very few years there will be no fearless British officers to deal in that way with situations, which will then be far more serious. The Government of Bengal went on to say that this outbreak was the outcome of the unrest and want of respect for established authority which have been so widely spread by Mr. Gandhi's propaganda. But all that is the result really of a Government which has ceased to rule. And that is a condition which, all through the East, very quickly brings its own nemesis.

The predecessor of the noble Earl had a specific for dealing with Gandhi's *Satyagraha* movement, which has developed since into the non-co-operation movement. Speaking, on behalf of the Government, in

Lord Sydenham.

this House on July 19 of last year, he said :—

"Do not interfere too hastily or too violently with an agitation of this nature. Let it kill itself as, in time, it will."

The noble Earl must have learned since then that this movement has developed into far greater dimensions than it had at that time, and that the agitation now seems as if it might before long pass beyond the control of the Government. The fact is that this movement of Gandhi's is a new feature in our experience in India. It is an experience which the Government of India have never quite had before, and the Government of India may have underrated it, or they may have regarded it as too serious and too dangerous to resist.

We have never yet had an Indian leader who was accepted as of Divine origin, and now there are many millions of Indians who believe that Gandhi can raise men from the dead by a few words, and that he is already the ruler of India. I am afraid that the Viceroy's five interviews with him will greatly strengthen that belief among the ignorant masses of India. The success of those interviews may be judged by the statement which Gandhi subsequently sent to the Press. In it he said :—

"The Ali brothers, like me, continue wilfully to break the law of sedition, and therefore to court arrest. Sooner or later, and that during this year, if we can carry the country with us, we must bring about a situation when the Government must arrest us or grant the people's demands."

That means that Gandhi believes that if he and the Ali brothers are arrested, there will be risings all over India, and that he will be able to say that that is entirely the fault of the repressive measures of the Government. On the other hand, if they are not arrested and are allowed to carry on their present propaganda in the way in which it is now being conducted, the time will come when our position in India will become practically impossible.

In our time I know of no parallel to the Gandhi movement, except the remarkable career of the Mahdi in the Sudan, and the Mahdi's career cost the Sudan tens of thousands of lives. Already Gandhi is responsible for the loss of many more Indian lives than was caused in suppressing the most dangerous rebellion that India has ever seen.

I must warn your Lordships that our authority in India is steadily waning at

the present time, and that there is no other authority which can possibly stand in its place. Gandhi's plan of making life impossible to Europeans in India is much more dangerous than a rising, which can always be met face to face and put down. I could give your Lordships numerous instances to show what white men and women have to endure in India, where the object is to reduce their position to that of a beleaguered garrison cut off from necessary supplies and services.

The European Association has made four specific suggestions which, as the noble Earl has seen them, I will not quote. I do not for a moment expect him to give any details of the steps which are taken or to be taken, but I hope he will be able to say that the Government of India realises the growing gravity of the situation, understands where the stirring up of race hatred among the ignorant and fanatical masses must lead us, and is preparing to take steps to save the situation before it is too late. In parts of India now crime and corruption are steadily growing, and intimidation is rampant, as it is in different degrees in Ireland, in Egypt, and in Palestine, where also minorities are doing their best to attack the British Empire. We have even seen lately an attempt to produce a sort of terror in this country.

Before long the masses of India will acutely feel the effects of the lapse of the authority which has given them security and order in the past, and will also feel the growing inefficiency of Government in many of its Departments. Believe me my Lords, they will unhesitatingly throw the whole blame of this upon us, and then they will demand, as the extremists are now doing, that British rule in India should be brought to an end. Then, as has happened in all the long centuries of Indian history where rule has lapsed, there will come a chaos which, in my opinion, will be deeper and darker than the chaos which followed the collapse of the Mogul Empire. I beg to ask my Question.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (THE EARL OF LYTTON): My Lords, when I first saw my noble friend's Question upon the Paper I was in some doubt as to what his motive could have been in asking it, because the suppression of disorder and the protection of life and property is the duty of the executive Government of India, as of the Government in every country in the world. And I

feel that I might, perhaps, have answered my noble friend in a sentence by saying that in order to protect the lives and property of Europeans and loyal Indians the Government will take whatever steps appear to them to be necessary in any situation which may develop from day to day.

Parliament is entitled to assume that the executive Government will fulfil this elementary duty of every Government, at any rate until it has evidence to the contrary. It is not the function of Parliament to tell the Executive how to carry out such a duty as this, though, of course, it is the right and proper function of Parliament to criticise the Executive for any error for which they may be responsible in fulfilling this particular function. When the noble Lord's Question appeared on the Paper I was not sure whether his object was to state that the Government had failed in any respect in the past in its duty of protecting the lives and property of the citizens of India. I am not quite sure now, having heard the noble Lord's speech, whether that is really his motive. He has drawn a very gloomy picture of the state of affairs in India, and one to which, I can assure him, I am not prepared to subscribe. I cannot for a moment agree with him when he says that the only place where a European is not insulted in the streets is in the Native Indian States. Even so, I did not gather from his speech that he wished to hold the Government responsible for the picture which he had drawn, supposing it had been a true one. But I may say to him that if he will formulate a charge against the executive Government in India, so far as the Secretary of State is responsible for it, I am prepared at any moment to meet him and defend it against any criticism which he may raise.

I was rather disposed, on the whole, to believe, at any rate until I heard the noble Lord's speech, that his object in placing his Question on the Paper was to give me an opportunity of correcting somewhat the picture of the state of affairs in India which has been drawn recently in the newspapers, and of assuring your Lordships of the confidence which His Majesty's Government feel in those who are now responsible for the executive Government in India. Anyhow, with your Lordships' permission. I wish to take this opportunity of saying a few words in that sense. I can find no justification for the statements which have been recently made in the Press and for the

picture which the noble Lord has just presented to the House. It is true that from time to time messages are sent by the Calcutta correspondent of the *Morning Post* describing in very lurid terms the situation in India; but your Lordships can judge what value to attach to this informant when I remind the House that a few weeks ago this same correspondent was responsible for circulating a story that there had been a mutiny in a Sikh regiment which had resulted in the disbanding of the unit after eighteen men had been shot. I have no doubt that report was widely believed in this country. But we found, on investigation, that there was no shadow of truth of any kind in the statement, and I can only believe that it was circulated with the direct purpose and object of discrediting the Government in India at the present time.

Then my noble friend has referred to the European Association. He says that this Association is not an alarmist body. I am afraid I find it very difficult to agree with him in that matter. But whatever may be the views of the Association itself, he will hardly, I think, deny that the paid agent and lecturer of that Association in this country at this moment is most certainly an alarmist source of information. The Rev. P. Sanderson, who is, I understand, the representative, agent, and lecturer of the European Association in this country, is now going about lecturing to the people, and inserting articles in the newspapers, to the effect that the lives of Englishmen in India are in danger, and that officials of the Civil Service are so hampered by the India Office that it is impossible for them to do their duty or to enforce the law.

Lately he has been writing to Members of Parliament to tell them that the Government are expecting a rising in Bihar this month; that inadequate protection had been provided; and that all English women whom sickness has prevented from leaving at once will certainly be murdered with every circumstance of outrage and horror. These are the words used by the European Association which, my noble friend says, is not an alarmist body. I can conceive of nothing more mischievous, and of no greater disservice, either to the Government or to the welfare of the people of India, than that the people of this country should be given a picture of that kind at the present time. Surely, it is the duty of any man who receives information

which entitles him to believe that there is a critical situation in India, calling for prompt protective measures, to place the evidence upon which he relied for those statements before the Government, in order that they might take the opportunity of providing the necessary protection. The very persons from whom this gentleman withholds his information are the only people who can take the necessary steps to deal with it, if it is true.

On receipt of letters from Members of Parliament to whom Mr. Sanderson has been writing, we telegraphed to the Government of India to find out what truth there was in his statements, and we received a reply from the Viceroy to the effect that those statements had been grossly exaggerated, and that the situation, which in May was creating a great deal of anxiety, had by now been considerably relieved. We were assured that so far as the Government were concerned no rising is anticipated. Moreover, we were told that at no time did the Government, or any official on behalf of the Government, state that a rising was expected in Bihar, though such a statement was made by an officer of the Bihar Light Horse to his men. This statement, which Mr. Sanderson has been circulating with improvement of his own, owes its origin really to the fear of the planters themselves, because this Bihar Light Horse is a body composed, I understand, largely of planters. Their anxiety is very intelligible, and is an anxiety with which I greatly sympathise, but the statement did not originate, as Mr. Sanderson has been saying, from any official source. The telegram concludes by saying that, according to the latest reports, the agitation has now declined in bitterness; that the feeling against Europeans is less evident; and that the planters themselves are less apprehensive of trouble.

I do not want to err on the other side, in rebutting what I think are the grave exaggerations of my noble friend, by drawing a fanciful or in any way rosy picture of the state of affairs in India. The situation there is quite serious enough, and the anxieties of those upon whom the responsibilities of Government rest are grave enough without these calculated misrepresentations. As your Lordships are aware, the whole world at this moment is filled with a dangerous, and, I think, unprecedented spirit of unrest and disorder. There is hardly a country in the

world in which the Government has not ample cause for anxiety, and where methods of agitation quite unprecedented are not proceeding.

India certainly has not escaped this epidemic. We are often told that there are 300,000,000 in India, most of whom are ignorant, uneducated, excitable and superstitious people, and the noble Lord has again reminded your Lordships this evening that there has been carried on amongst that population an intensive campaign of anti-Government and anti-British sentiment by a man who is not only a popular figure, not only revered and respected for his private life, but is, as the noble Lord has said, believed to possess supernatural powers, and, by some, to have divine origin. I think it says very much for the good sense of the people of India, and for the wisdom and discretion of the Executive authorities in that country that, given those circumstances, the situation is not very much worse than it is.

The noble Lord has referred to what Lord Sinha said two years ago. The non-co-operation campaign has, it is true, been carried on with the greatest intensity, and with every effort which Mr. Gandhi and his followers can summon to their aid. So far as it has gone at present it has conspicuously failed in its object. Its appeal to the educated classes failed lamentably. It is true that there was a temporary success when it turned from the educated classes to the young students. Even that phase has passed by. A temporary success has been gained by helping to harness the non-co-operation movement to the labour disturbances which exist in India as in all other countries. The noble Lord has referred to the success—if it may be so described—achieved amongst the coolie tea planters in Assam. The campaign, having failed in all other directions, is at the present moment making a special effort among the ignorant and excitable masses in India. I do not deny, for a moment, that that means a very much more dangerous phase in the campaign, a phase which must occasion the gravest anxiety to the Governments who are responsible for preserving order when such a thing is going on.

I think that the worst features at the present moment are the attempts to boycott individuals, and to endeavour to withdraw from service the domestic servants upon whom, as my noble friend says,

Europeans in India are specially dependent. But when my noble friend says that the interviews which Mr. Gandhi recently had with the Viceroy have only tended to increase his importance and the belief in his divine origin, I must disagree with him. I think the opposite is proved out of Mr. Gandhi's own mouth. The mere fact that he found it necessary to explain and excuse himself to his followers for having met the Viceroy to discuss the situation is a proof that the result is not, as the noble Lord said, to increase the power and popularity of Mr. Gandhi, but to make it necessary for him to defend his action.

The present phase of the campaign in India is a very dangerous and anxious one, and to ask, at such a time, whether the Government is alive to the danger seems to me to be really asking a superfluous question. There is not a single Provincial Government in India at this moment which is not fully alive to the danger, and if it is suggested that the Government are not to be relied upon to take what steps are necessary I again venture to disagree entirely from the noble Lord. If he will bring any specific charges against the Government I shall be prepared to defend their action. So far as the Earl of Reading is concerned, he certainly needs no words of mine for his defence. He has only recently gone to India. He left this country with the complete confidence not only of your Lordships' House but of almost every section of opinion in the country, and since he has been there he has done nothing whatever to forfeit that confidence, but a great deal to enhance the reputation he took to India.

The very incident of the exodus of the coolies from Assam to Eastern Bengal is a matter which, but for the discretion, wisdom and promptitude of Lord Ronaldshay's Government, might have proved very much more serious than it was. The noble Lord has spoken of from 300 to 400 cases of death from cholera amongst the coolies. I have no official information which will substantiate those figures. We were informed of 150 deaths from cholera at the end of May. It may be that by now the figures have increased to something like double the number, but I am unable to confirm the figures. I have no hesitation in saying that but for the prompt and effective action taken by Lord Ronaldshay's Government the situation and the casualties would have been much worse.

It may be said with regard to Bihar, where trouble has been recently anticipated, that because we have an Indian Governor we have less cause to feel confidence in his efficiency. I feel it is only right and due to Lord Sinha to say that His Majesty's Government have absolute and complete confidence in the efficiency, courage and wisdom of his administration. He has recently shown all these qualities in a circular which he issued to the officers in his Province setting forth the official attitude of his Government towards the non-co-operation movement. That document lacked nothing in the way of precision or courage, and it called forth at once very vigorous protests, criticisms and abuse, from the vernacular Press. Lord Sinha is in a very difficult position, and I think he may be trusted to deal with it with courage and discretion.

I have tried to correct in some respects, from information supplied to us in answer to direct questions from the Viceroy himself, the picture drawn by the noble Earl. I hope he will take some comfort from my assurance. Let me say that if he feels any anxiety with regard to the situation in India and desires specific information, I shall be always at his service. I hope he will seek to obtain his information from that source and will not be led astray by what I cannot help regarding as certainly the alarmist and exaggerated, and in many cases deliberately exaggerated, accounts of what is taking place in India, which appear in the Press. I beg him also not to lose confidence in those who are holding the positions of Viceroy and Governors of Provinces in India; at any rate, until they have done something to deserve it. He himself has held with great distinction such a post, and, therefore, knows what are the difficulties and the responsibilities of the Governor of an Indian Province. Those difficulties and anxieties are greatly increased at the present time. The men on the spot, in these circumstances, are entitled to the support of the people at home, and in spite of the exaggerated opinions in the Press I can assure your Lordships that, so far as the Government are concerned, they have their full and unabated confidence.

LORD SYDENHAM: May I thank the noble Earl for his very complete reply to my Question? I cannot help saying that he has attacked me for things I never said. I never spoke of the danger of a rising. I

The Earl of Lytton.

spoke of a rising as being a less dangerous thing than non-co-operation in its effect upon the lives of our countrymen. He spoke as though I had attacked some one. I was not attacking any one, still less was I making any sort of reflection on Lord Sinha in Bihar, whose recent circular I know of and who has been attacked by his fellow-countrymen in consequence of it. I am glad to know that the noble Earl looks upon this non-co-operation movement, as I do, as a very serious danger. I am glad to learn that he agrees with me absolutely on that point. Therefore, I do not think I have done any harm in raising this matter this afternoon.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 26th July, 1921.

PERSIA.

LORD LAMINGTON rose to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can give any information as to the present political position in Persia. The noble Lord said: My Lords, it is some time since we heard anything about the position of affairs in Persia. I do not think there has been a discussion since the time when the Anglo-Persian Agreement was framed—an Agreement which we all hoped would bear fruit, but which has regrettably not been ratified by the Persian Government, and, I believe, has, in fact, been denounced by them. That is a considerable period, and since then there have been kaleidoscopic changes in the Persian Administration. I do not profess to know a great deal of what has been going on, and therefore my Question is put practically solely for the purpose of seeing whether we could be informed by the Government about the position of Persian affairs, both as they affect ourselves, and also as they affect internal matters.

On one point only do I wish to give expression to my own views. We have learnt from the Press that the British forces in Northern Persia, numbering about 3,000 men, have been withdrawn. I do not think that that withdrawal is likely to be hurtful to our interests; rather the reverse. It always seemed absolutely impracticable for us to maintain even the comparatively small force of 3,000 men so far away from our base. The only point in regard to that is whether the force may have been withdrawn prematurely. Per-

haps the noble Marquess, the Secretary of State, will be able to say whether any adverse consequences have resulted from that force being withdrawn before the Persian Government had time to form their own force for the maintenance of order in their country.

Then again, I do not know what is the present position of the *gendarmérie* which used to be officered by Swedes. The Swedes, I believe, were removed, but again no definite information has reached me as to what is the present position of that force. We were told recently in the Press (and this is the one point that I should like to make) that the South Persian Rifles are to be disbanded. If that statement is accurate I regret it very much, for the reason that this country has special interests in the Persian Gulf. Most of us are aware what a wonderful work this country has for many decades past—more than a hundred years—carried on in the Persian Gulf, not for our own selfish interests, but for the good of everybody who wished to trade or to cross the waters of the Gulf. It is, however, obviously impossible for us to safeguard the position of affairs in the Gulf unless we also have some influence over the shores of the country surrounding it. In my view, therefore, whatever happens in Northern Persia, it is absolutely essential that we should be in a position to secure that order and good government are maintained on the coasts of the Gulf. If the South Persian Rifles, whose headquarters used to be at Shiraz, are to be disbanded, I do not see what protection is to be afforded in the future for the special interests we have there.

The noble Marquess himself has made Persia a life study and is a master of every detail connected with that country. I think that in his standard book on Persia, or in one of his speeches, he has referred to Persia and the Persian Gulf as being practically the *glacis* of the defence of India. I do not think that is any exaggeration of the position. It is, therefore, very serious indeed if we are to have no security for good administration in Southern Persia, from Shiraz right up to Ispahan. We have our special interests, too, in the Bakhtiari oilfields, and along all the shores which enclose the waters of the Gulf. Perhaps the noble Marquess will be able to reassure me that the South Persian Rifles are not to be disbanded, and that our position in that part of the world, therefore, will be safeguarded.

Another point upon which I should like some information is as to whether the Soviet Government have any forces in Persia. I believe they have some still at Enzeli; certainly, some little time ago, they had very considerable forces on the frontiers of Khorassan and Astrabad. Whether those Soviet forces are still on the frontiers of those provinces I do not know, but I shall be very glad indeed if the noble Marquess can say whether any Bolshevik forces at all are at present on Persian territory. Not long ago the Soviet Government sent a representative to Tehran, who went there with all the glory and splendour that attached to the Russian representative in the time of the Tsardom. It was said in the Press that he was attended by a staff of sixty persons, and recently there appeared a notice in the Press of a very splendid fête given at Tehran which our Minister attended, and which was presumably attended by representatives of other countries also, although when the Soviet representative first went to Tehran it was stated that the French Government would refuse to recognise him.

Perhaps the noble Marquess will give some information as to the present attitude of the Persian Government towards the Russian Soviet Government, because that must gravely affect the whole situation in Persia. I do not think any people is less likely than the Persian people to be affected by Bolshevism. At the same time, if the Soviet Government are able to control the Persian Government the consequences might be very serious. Naturally, the attitude of the Persian Government towards the Soviet Government must also be reflected in their attitude towards ourselves. I have no idea as to whether, or to what extent, they are well-disposed towards us at the present time.

I should be glad to know also what is the present condition of the interior of the country—whether peace and order are maintained in spite of the disbandment, as I understand, of these various forces; whether the present Administration is still in a position to secure good government, or whether there is a renewal of that disorder which a few years ago so disgraced Persia and was such a menace to the whole welfare of that country. After the Anglo-Persian Agreement came to an end I understand that the Persian Government were still very solicitous to have British advisers, and perhaps the noble Marquess will say

how many of these advisers are still in Tehran. One of them, Mr. Armitage Smith, was appointed to look after the finances of Persia. We should like to know whether he is still there, and whether he has been able to do anything to put the finances of that country on a better footing. We know that lack of money has long been the cause of weakness in Persia. The internal corruption has been so great that no Administration could possibly have been carried out unless reforms were instituted and made effective. Possibly the noble Marquess will be able to say whether that has been possible under the guidance of Mr. Armitage Smith.

Bearing on this matter there is, of course, the important question of Customs. I am under the impression that a new tariff was framed not very long ago, and I should like to know what effect that has had upon the trade of Persia and upon our trade with Persia. These are the various points upon which I hope that the noble Marquess will be able to inform your Lordships, more particularly in regard to whether the advisers, who, as I understand, were asked for voluntarily by the Persian Government, still remain in the country and are able to carry out effectually any duties allotted to them.

LORD SYDENHAM: My Lords, the situation in Persia, as my noble friend has said, has very greatly changed since it was discussed by your Lordships' House on November 16 last. Then we had withdrawn our troops from Meshed; but General Ironside was still in occupation of Kazvin and out-post affairs with Bolsheviks were constantly taking place. The Cossack Division had become disintegrated, though efforts were being made to re-organise it with the assistance of British officers. The Anglo-Persian Agreement was, at that time, in suspense, but the noble Marquess told the House that he hoped that that very evasive body the Mejliss would be summoned and that the Agreement might still be ratified.

As matters stand now, I believe, we have no military forces left in Persia, though whether the South Persian Rifles still exist as an organised body under British officers I am not quite sure. The point is one of very great importance. The Cossack Division does not appear to have been reconstituted, as was hoped, and I doubt very much whether any effective body of that kind remains in the employment of

Lord Lamington.

the Government of Persia. The Agreement has not been ratified. My noble friend said that it had been denounced, but in any case I assume it is now a dead letter. The much earlier Anglo-Russian Agreement, of course, is also dead, and has been dead for some time. Persia seems to be left to her own resources, both political and military. Persia, therefore, may be said to have self-determination—self-determination which is regarded in some quarters as the most certain passport to contentment, prosperity, and progress.

On January 21, 1918, the noble Marquess said that we desired that Persia should retain her "complete independence after the war." Then he pointed out that the unfortunate condition of that country at the end of last year was "the direct and inevitable result of the war." It is quite possible that when the Germans escorted Communism into Russia they did not know how far it would lead. But, in my opinion, the effect of Bolshevism in Central Asia and throughout the East has not yet reached its culminating point, and may be felt long after Lenin and his accomplices have passed away. General Dunsterville's wonderful expedition to the Caspian, General Malleon's march to Meshed, and General Ironside's occupation of Kazvin, I take it, were all due to the menace of Bolshevism to Persia. The total expenditure thus incurred by the British Government must have been very large, the objects being, as I understand, to save Persia from the fate of Bokhara and also to avert Bolshevik influence from Afghanistan. That is a perfectly defensible policy. We looked on Persia as a helpless country and we sought to enable her to maintain her independence, which the noble Marquess told us was the object of the British Government. The Khalifat Party seems to take very little interest in Persia, otherwise it ought to be grateful to us for the sacrifices we have made to preserve the independence of this Mohamedan country.

The question to-day, on which I am sure the noble Marquess will throw much light, is how far our great efforts for Persia have been successful in safeguarding the interests of that country and our own interests in the Persian Gulf. The Bolsheviks have not been able to set up a Soviet in Tehran, as they seemed once to contemplate, nor have they been able to raise the people against their Government. I believe with my noble friend that it is a task quite beyond their powers. But they

remain at Resht and Enzeli in Persian territory, and I believe they are in Azarbaijan, the conditions of which remain extremely obscure.

On the whole, I think, it may fairly be claimed that our policy in regard to Persia has been reasonably successful though it has, of course, been exceedingly costly. We have, however, failed to keep Bolshevik influence out of Afghanistan, and I do not know of any way in which we could have done so. The attitude of the Amir appears to be to wait and see whether the Bolsheviks, or the Nationalist Turks, or ourselves are likely to prove the strongest. Our Mission, as your Lordships know, has been in Kabul for more than six months. Meanwhile, the Amir appears to have made a Treaty with the Bolsheviks and another with the Nationalist Turks, both of which may be hostile to our interests. Whether he has also been negotiating with Tehran I have no idea. For the sake of our prestige in the East I hope that the Mission to Kabul will terminate as soon as possible.

Meanwhile, events appear to be moving rapidly in Russia. A fortnight ago a Bolshevik paper stated that in the districts not famine-stricken the people were waiting "for the collapse of the Soviet régime." This paper went on to boast that

"those who succeed us will have to build on ruins, a completely devastated country, in the dead silence of a cemetery."

That is the natural result of nationalisation applied on a grand scale. In the appalling conditions which now prevail in Russia I can hardly think it possible that the Red Armies will be able to develop much more activity, and, as Communism and the dictatorship of the proletariat depend absolutely upon military force, their collapse may now be nearer at hand than some of us believe. If that is so, and if also the Greek victories prove decisive, I think the whole situation may become much clearer and there will be a repercussion of these events in Persia and Afghanistan, though, as I said, I still believe that Bolshevism as a propagandist force may be able to maintain itself in Central Asia for some time longer.

In any case, I assume that military pressure upon Persia is no longer possible and that the Persian question, therefore, will become a purely domestic one. As the noble Marquess said—

"A peaceful Persia, a stable Persia, a friendly Persia, and an independent Persia are the corner stones of British policy."

Lord Sydenham.

A friendly Persia we certainly ought to have after the great sacrifices we have made for her. Independent I assume that Persia now completely is. Whether she will be "peaceful or stable" will depend entirely upon the working of the democratic system with which she has been endowed. I hope the noble Marquess will be able to say whether the Central Government will be able now to maintain order in the provinces, and whether our interests in the Gulf region, to which my noble friend referred, will not be endangered by promiscuous brigandage which so easily arises in those parts. I hope also that any future British activities in Persia will be limited to advice and the loan of British officers, and that we shall not embark on any more military adventures in that country which, at the present moment, I think we are not able to afford. So far as I can see, Persia must mainly regenerate herself, and if she fails in that task, it seems to me that the only course before her will be one of complete disruption.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (THE MARQUESS CURZON OF KEDLESTON): My Lords, the series of questions which have been put to me by the noble Lord, Lord Lamington, supplemented, as they have been, by the query of the noble Lord, Lord Sydenham, are practically an invitation to me to give your Lordships some account of the present situation in Persia. Both noble Lords have alluded to the last occasion when we had a discussion on the matter in your Lordships' House—that was on November 16, 1920—and perhaps your Lordships will permit me for a moment to recall the point up to which I had taken the narrative of Persian events at that date. In the remarks I then made I gave a short *résumé* of the position and experiences of Persia during the war, and in the course of which it was owing to the sacrifices and exertions of the British Government and the British forces alone that she had been saved, firstly, from the machinations of the Germans, secondly, from Turkish inroads, and lastly, from the invasion of Soviet forces on the North.

In those remarks I also gave a short summary of the Anglo-Persian Agreement which had been concluded between our Government and hers in August of the previous year. I indicated how, in the darkest hour of the Persian misfortunes, and in the almost complete collapse of her Government, we had offered, by the terms

of this Agreement, to re-organise her finances, to reform her military administration, to enable her to create a national Army, and to proceed to the development of her means of communication and her internal resources. For these purposes, I mentioned that the British Government had been willing to make a loan of £2,000,000 to the Persian Government. I ventured to say that no more disinterested and single-minded attempt was ever made by a Western Power to re-establish the existence, and secure the prosperity, of an Eastern country.

At the stage which had then been reached, I three times, in the course of my remarks, alluded to the position in which the Anglo-Persian Agreement then stood. Perhaps your Lordships will allow me in a sentence or two to remind you of what I said. I said—

“If the Persian Parliament accepts the Agreement, subject to such modifications as I indicated a little while ago, we shall do our best to help them through.”

Again, I said—

“If, on the other hand, the Persian Parliament declines to accept the Agreement, the Persian Government must take its own course. We shall have done our best to help them, and, if they are unwilling to accept our assistance, the responsibility must be theirs.”

The third quotation is as follows—

“They—that is, the Persian Government—have our earnest sympathy in their endeavours, but it rests with them to determine the orbit in which Persia desires that she shall henceforward move. If they desire the faithful execution of the Anglo-Persian Agreement, they may rely upon us to complete our part; but if they prefer to pursue their own course, and to trust to their own resources, we cannot place any obstacle in their path. The responsibility will be theirs and not ours.”

Such, my Lords, was the position in the latter part of last year.

There were already apparent serious obstacles in the path, to some of which the two noble Lords have referred. In the first place, there was the chronic instability of Persian Governments. The noble Lord, Lord Lamington, alluded to the rapid and almost bewildering succession of Persian Ministries during the period referred to. There have been over five in little more than a year, and your Lordships will understand how irreconcilable such conditions are with any degree either of contentment or good government in the country. Secondly, there was the reluctance of these successive Persian Ministries to summon the Mejliss or Parliament. I

had always, from the date of the signature of the Anglo-Persian Agreement, pleaded that the Mejliss should be summoned; that the Agreement should be laid before it; and by its judgment I for one was willing to abide; but, for one reason or another, successive Persian Ministers, in spite of their promises, failed to call this body together, and it has never been called together until this moment. It is not even called together now. The third difficulty was also alluded to by Lord Lamington—namely, the atmosphere of incurable intrigue that prevailed among Tehran politicians. Fourthly, our position in the North, at any rate, was successively weakened by the withdrawal of the British forces from Kazvin and the neighbourhood, which was imposed upon us by considerations partly of expediency and partly of finance. I think the noble Lord asked whether their disappearance had meant any substantial change in the situation. I will come to that in a moment. Certainly, their disappearance was attended by an inevitable and natural weakening in the influence which we have been able to exercise at Tehran. Lastly, among these obstacles to which I refer, may be mentioned the fact that already, at that period, the Persian Government was beginning to be afraid of revived Soviet Russia, and at the same time that her Ministers were endeavouring to extricate themselves from, or to repudiate, the Anglo-Persian Agreement, they were negotiating, and they finally concluded, a new Treaty with the Soviet authorities at Moscow. That Treaty was signed in February, 1921, and a copy of it was published in an enterprising journal, the *Manchester Guardian*, in this country.

It is a little difficult for any one, even from the inside, to follow the kaleidoscopic changes of this period. Prime Minister succeeded Prime Minister, as I said, with almost bewildering rapidity, and there were, in the time to which I refer, almost as many Persian policies as there were Prime Ministers. One week the policy would be that of abandoning the Anglo-Persian Agreement, but still keeping in touch with the British, and getting as much out of us as could be got. Another week the policy would be that of breaking with the British, but getting Swedes and Frenchmen and Americans to interest themselves in various aspects of the administration. In a third week we were confronted with complete subjection to Soviet

The Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.

forces. As an interlude in this drama, one of these Prime Ministers amused himself by putting into prison all his principal political opponents.

It was in the midst of this perplexing jumble of events that the Soviet Minister, to whom one of the noble Lords referred, Mr. Rothstein, appeared on the scene at Tehran, in the circumstances of show and self-advertisement to which the noble Lord referred. This was in April of the present year. Since his arrival there he has pursued the familiar Bolshevik methods; the exercise of ceaseless political propaganda; the promise, if not the payment, of money to those whose support he solicits; while always in the background there has been the presence of the Soviet forces, as to which the noble Lord was quite right when he said that, irrespective of the terms of the Russo-Persian Treaty, they still remained in the Persian province of Gilan.

That is, as I understand, the present position, and it seems to me that in the attitude it has adopted towards the Anglo-Persian Agreement the Persian Government has, in the exercise of what is now called self-determination, made its own choice. It has deliberately rejected the chance of recovering its fortunes with British aid. It has preferred to fall back upon the familiar game of playing off one foreign country against the other, and in the last resort it appears to be not unwilling to accept the caresses of the Soviet Government, caresses which usually end by strangling those to whom they are applied.

If the noble Lord asks me how I view the situation thus created, I am fain to confess that I regard it with a feeling of disappointment, almost of despair. The noble Lord, Lord Lamington, paid me the compliment of saying that during thirty years of my public life I have been interested in Persia. That is true. I do not think that during that period any foreigner has laboured harder for the independence and integrity and well-being of that country than I have done, and certainly no Government has done more, or has willingly accepted greater sacrifices, than the British Government throughout that period to re-establish, strengthen, and guarantee, the future existence of the Persian nation. As far as I can see, these labours have been largely in vain, and I am unaware of any encouragement at the present moment to persevere in this task.

It would be singularly unbecoming of me to make any complaint or utter any re-

proach against the Persian Government. They are entitled to follow their own courses, and if they prefer to find salvation in Moscow they have a perfect right to do so. But I may be permitted, as an old friend, to speak to them and to utter a word of warning, and to say that in the long run the main sufferers by the policy that is now being adopted will not be Great Britain and other countries, but will be Persia herself.

A number of questions about individual episodes, or branches of the subject, have been put to me by the two noble Lords, and I will endeavour to reply to them. Lord Lamington alluded to the presence at Tehran of Mr. Armitage Smith, a capable Treasury official, who, in pursuance of the terms of the Anglo-Persian Agreement, was sent out there last year to re-organise its finances. He has had a very troubled career. After the disappointment of the first few months he returned to this country, but in the hope of being able to do good work for the country to which he is so much attached, he returned there in the spring of the present year. He has with him a British staff of five members, and there are also two British advisers in the Ministry of Public Works. These are, I think, the sole British officials now in the administrative service of the Persian Government. The various British officers, who, in connection with the Agreement, were engaged in assisting Persia to re-organise her forces, have either retired, or are about to retire, in disgust at the way they have been treated. The position of Mr. Armitage Smith, as I have indicated, is one of exceeding difficulty. Against him are arrayed all the forces of selfishness, corruption and intrigue; and he finds himself in the same position as Mr. Schuster, the American, when he was in Persia attempting the same task. Whether Mr. Armitage Smith will be able to triumph over these difficulties I cannot say. At any rate, I wish him, and I am sure your Lordships do also, all success in his exceedingly delicate task.

Another question was about the present position of the South Persian Rifles. This force, as I think your Lordships know, was organised in the year 1916, under British and Indian officers, in order to preserve order, in the main, in the southern and eastern Provinces of Fasa, Yezd, and Kerman. Its maximum strength at any time was 8,000, and its strength is now something short of 6,000 men. It was

during the heyday of its existence, the only stable element in the centre and south of Persia, preserving order, keeping open the trade routes and rendering invaluable service to the Persian Government. I need hardly say that it was never intended to be a British force; or to typify the British occupation of that part of the country. On the contrary, it was a Persian force, and was intended to be the nucleus of the Persian Army of the future to which we were always prepared to hand it over.

Up till March 31 of this year this force was financed by the British and Indian Governments in combination. At that date, the Indian Government, in despair at the vacillation of the Persian authorities, withdrew their contribution. His Majesty's Government made a final contribution in order to facilitate the ultimate disbandment of this force, or its transference to the Persian authorities, should they so desire it. The present position is this: when that contribution is exhausted the force must inevitably be disbanded. The Persian Government have adopted towards this force the characteristic attitude. They profess a warm desire to take it over, but that desire is compatible with a proposal to dispense with the British officers who are responsible for its discipline and its utility, and with an extreme reluctance to find the pay. Lord Lamington said that he would regret the disbandment of this force. So would I. I think it would be calamitous, because one realises what the consequences would be. The disbanded soldier usually becomes in most countries, not only in eastern countries, a bandit. He becomes a highway robber on the roads, and, unless the Persian Government see wisdom in the interval, I can anticipate no other result than that the trade routes will again be insecure; that the lives of those who are engaged, in business or otherwise in those parts of Persia, will become precarious; and that we may have a resumption of the old conditions of anarchy and disorder from which, exclusively by our efforts, that part of Persia was recovered.

I have answered, as I believe with absolute truth, the questions which have been put to me by the noble Lords. The picture that I have drawn has been the picture of a country with a great and historic past, a country for which we have had the warmest sympathy, for which, as Lord Sydenham pointed out, we have made countless sacrifices and upon which we have

spent millions of money since the beginning of the war; but it is a country which now appears to be marching, of its own accord, with deliberate and logical steps, towards an end which I do not attempt to forecast, but which cannot, I think, be otherwise than most unfortunate. I wish I could have given a more roseate account of Persia or a more sanguine estimate of the situation than I have been able to do. Of all the speeches that I have ever had to make upon Persia—and they have been many—the one which I make this afternoon has been delivered with the greatest regret.

LORD LAMINGTON: My Lords, with your Lordships' permission, I should like to thank the noble Marquess the Leader of the House for his very complete, although very gloomy, picture. May I say that I was specially glad to hear his repudiation of the rumour that His Majesty's Government had been always indisposed to the summoning of the Mejliss. It was bruited about that this was the case, and I am very glad that he has given his denial on that particular point. I only say in conclusion that I hope the noble Marquess will not be discouraged. If, in the future, there is any chance of getting Persia on a better footing again, of making her independent and friendly to ourselves, I am sure he will be the one person in His Majesty's Government who will most endeavour to do so.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 4th August, 1921.

SUKKUR BARRAGE SCHEME.

LORD LAMINGTON rose to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India what are the reasons for not appointing a Committee of expert engineers to consider the advisability of carrying out the proposed Sukkur barrage on the Indus. The noble Lord said: I am not at this hour of the night going to venture to give your Lordships' House any detailed information about the project proposed, vast and important though it is. I have had some correspondence with my noble friend, the Under-Secretary of State for India on the subject. Put very briefly it is in connection with a proposal which has been adumbrated for a number of years of increasing the cultivable area of central Sind by a system of canals. One of the chief canals is called the Rohri Canal. Why it has not been undertaken in the past is owing to different vicissitudes,

The Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.

but I think all the expert opinion agrees that it has been too long delayed. It would probably have been put into operation except for the fact that in 1912 there was a big irrigation project in the Punjab, and it was thought that the waters then withdrawn from the Indus for this scheme would reduce the flow of the Indus to such an extent that it would be impossible to carry out successfully the Rohri Canal scheme. Events have proved that this was a false expectation.

Then was considered the question of building a barrage to hold up the waters to enable the Rohri Canal to be built, and also a new system of canals on the right bank of the Indus. All I have to say is that the barrage enormously adds to the expense of the scheme. At the place where it was originally projected a great band of rock crosses the Indus, and that was the site selected for the dam. Even that site, though it offers all the facilities of a rock foundation, has certain difficulties. It was then considered desirable to look for other sites. However, now the engineers of Bombay have decided upon a site only 6,000 yards below this great band of rock, on the sand. But it is very much feared that if a great dam is executed there the waters of the Indus will be so held up that it will be quite possible they might break out a new route and possibly cut a channel to the west of the town of Sukkur, leaving the railway bridge perfectly useless, and also, perhaps, doing grave destruction to the systems of irrigation already working.

In addition, if this dam were built, it would mean an enormous increase to the cost of the work, and also—and it is to this that the point of my question is particularly directed—in building the barrage first instead of commencing with the Rohri Canal the dam would be built at a quicker rate than the canal could be cut, and for a number of years the capital sunk in building the dam would practically be unproductive—perhaps for five or six years. Of course, the extra expense incurred would also entail raising the assessments paid by the cultivators for the use of water. Those who have examined the figures maintain that the cost of this barrage or dam would be greatly minimised, but it would be far in excess of the sum that has been put down to it. Those who think that this is a mistaken policy contend that the canal ought to be first commenced, because as soon as the first two sections are cut there will at once be a productive income.

In 1913 a Committee was appointed to inquire into the whole question and it was decided that the completion of the canal and barrage should be simultaneous. The canal would take longer than the barrage, and should be the work to be undertaken first. In the opinion of many engineers, if the Rohri Canal were cut it would be found that there would be sufficient water flowing to obviate the building of the barrage at all. It would be better to commence with the canal. Then there would be time to see what amount of water was to be obtained from the Indus and also time for an examination as to the best site for the barrage.

I could quote the opinions of many eminent engineers in the matter, but I will be content with mentioning that of Sir Murdoch Macdonald, who, having gone into the question, said that he could not understand why any one should propose to build the barrage first. During the first period the natural levels of the river were at all times high enough to supply water over a large area. That is the opinion of an eminent engineer, and it is impossible to understand why the authorities should determine on beginning the work on the barrage first. All I ask is that the Government of India should consider whether an inquiry is not desirable in the face of so many expert opinions. I presided at a meeting in London the other day where there was not one person who did not agree as to the undesirability of commencing the barrage first and inquired what earthly reason there was for the Government of India to force this costly and expensive work as the first undertaking, instead of taking the advice so often given that it was the Rohri Canal that should be commenced first.

THE UNDER - SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (THE EARL OF LYTTON): My Lords, the Sukkur barrage scheme to which the noble Lord has referred is an immense undertaking of irrigation development which has been prepared by the Government of Bombay, and which if it can be successfully carried out is expected to make the Province of Sind one of the largest cotton-growing districts within the Empire. It has recently attracted some attention in London, because at a meeting of the East India Association it was adversely criticised by Dr. Summers and other distinguished engineers who have now retired from the

service of the Government in India. There are two features of the scheme, the first financial, the second technical. The noble Lord touched upon both. In its financial aspect—involving such questions as how the money is to be found, whether the estimates as to cost are reliable, and whether the scheme is likely to be remunerative—it has not yet been approved. This matter has been referred back to the Government of India, by whom it is now being considered. I shall therefore say nothing about that aspect. The technical aspect of it—involving the site of the barrage, design, construction, etc.—has been approved by the Secretary of State and it is this approval to which my noble friend takes exception. He has supported the view taken by Dr. Summers that the building of the barrage should be postponed until after the construction of the Rohri Canal. I shall not, of course, argue the merits of the case with my noble friend, but I can tell him that on this point the unanimous opinion of irrigation experts in India is against him. Those who have studied the question recently on the spot, consider that if the irrigated area were greatly increased without building the barrage a season of short rainfall might produce a calamity so grave that no Government could take the risk of such a possibility.

In view of the opinions recently expressed at the meeting to which I have referred the Secretary of State has been asked whether he will refer the matter to a committee of experts before giving his approval. The Secretary of State replied in the House of Commons on August 2, that he had already given his approval to the scheme, subject to a further consideration of its finance, and that he did not propose to adopt the course suggested. My noble friend now asks me to give him the reasons for this decision. They are: (1) That in the seven years which have intervened since the Committee of experts reported in 1913, the whole problem has been exhaustively re-examined by the best irrigation engineers and revenue officers in Bombay, who have recommended the present scheme; and (2) That the Government of India is satisfied that the present scheme is free from the objections raised by the Committee of 1913 to the earlier scheme. Of course, this is not a matter on which I desire to dogmatise, nor I am sure would the Secretary of State refuse to adopt the course which my noble friend suggests if there were good grounds for doing so.

The Earl of Lytton.

I submit that there are only two grounds which would justify the Secretary of State in referring this matter to yet another committee. They are: (1) If there were any difference of opinion amongst the expert advisers of the Government of India; and (2) if he had any reason to doubt the competence of those who have given the advice. Neither of these two conditions exists. The advice has been unanimous and it has been given by competent engineers with the most recent experience of the problem. You cannot go on referring a matter from one set of experts to another indefinitely. This is no new question. It has been examined most exhaustively and the present scheme represents the most recent and I think I may say final judgment on the matter. In such matters there must be some finality. When the Government has obtained the best expert advice available and is prepared to take the responsibility of acting upon it, the Secretary of State is not disposed to withhold his approval.

LORD LAMINGTON: I beg to thank the noble Earl for his reply. At the same time I think it is eminently unsatisfactory. We have never had the names of any of the experts who gave advice which is in flat contradiction of the opinion of the committees appointed by Lord Curzon in 1902-3 and again in 1913. There is nothing to show that the enormous expense which is going to be incurred—

THE EARL OF LYTTON: Order!

LORD LAMINGTON: I regret very much that the Secretary of State is so obdurate in this matter and only hope that those responsible may be surcharged any expense.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Wednesday, 10th August, 1921.

PUBLIC SERVICES IN INDIA.

LORD AMPHILL had given Notice to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether His Majesty's Government have accepted the principle advocated both by the Government of India and the Joint Select Committee, that members of the public Services in India should, in certain circumstances, be permitted to retire on proportional pensions. The noble Lord said: My Lords, the noble Earl the Under-Secretary of State for India was good enough to write to me in order to warn me

that he would not be able to give me a definite answer to my Question to-day. But I have, nevertheless, troubled him to come here, because I hope that he will be able to assure us that there will be some announcement of the policy of the Government before Parliament rises.

The importance of this Question is far greater than appears on the surface, and it is not possible to explain it in a few sentences. The fact is that at the present time the incomparable loyalty of British officials in India is being very seriously strained, and it may well be near breaking point. The Government take the loyalty of the public Services in India for granted, but although Englishmen will stand a good deal in the cause of duty, there are some things to which as men, and as men of honour, they cannot submit. There is a limit beyond which no Englishman will go.

Your Lordships may perhaps have been satisfied by the recent assurance of the noble Earl who speaks for the India Office that there is nothing in the present state of India to cause inordinate anxiety or alarm, but I wonder whether your Lordships are aware that the prevailing distemper has actually touched the brains of the body politic in India. It is not only the placid contentment of the masses that has been disturbed, for there is something more than vague discontent among those—the officials, that is—who are responsible for the protection and guidance of those masses. I have a personal letter from India in which there is a significant sentence. The writer was speaking about general unrest, and he added :—

“The real unrest to-day is among the English officials.”

Of that startling statement I have seen abundant proof, not only in private letters, but also in the Press.

The best thing I can do to explain the position is to let your Lordships hear it out of the mouths of those who are on the spot, and who are actually concerned; and I hope, therefore, your Lordships will allow me to read one or two brief extracts from private letters. These letters were not all addressed to me; some of them were written to friends who happened to meet me and who showed them to me. Here is one :—

“To those who are fully acquainted with the working of the Oriental mind it will be obvious that the general trend of high officials' speeches and announcements will very seriously undermine the moral influence which alone enables the solitary British official to carry on his work in the district.”

This is another extract from the letter of a different person :—

“Personally, I feel that service under a Government which has definitely given up all pretence of governing is impossible. As a bachelor one might take the risk; but it is hateful to be forced to take it with one's hands tied. As a married man, however, it is obviously out of the question.”

This is the third extract which I have noted. The letter, I may say, was not written to me. After similar remarks, the writer says :—

“I am sending you this so that you may be able to refute by a concrete example the self-satisfied folk at home who say all is well in India.”

And here is another :—

“Mr. E. S. Montagu has stated in the House that he has had but one application to resign on account of the new régime. Let him announce anything in the nature of fair terms, and he will find ample vacancies to which to promote Indian officials.”

The point is this. In spite of definite promises and assurances, no fair terms—no definite terms at all—for premature retirement have yet been announced, and the terms which the Secretary of State is believed to be pressing upon the Government of India are very far from fair.

There is a general feeling of bitterness because the promises held out to the Services in the Report of the Joint Committee on Indian Reform are not being fulfilled by those in authority. The Joint Committee, in paragraph 36 of their Report, put it on record that those Services have deserved the admiration and gratitude of the whole Empire, and that their position under the new conditions will be very difficult. They concluded with this definite assurance :—

“If there are members of the Service whose doubts as to the changes to be made are so deeply rooted that they feel they cannot usefully endeavour to take part in them, then the Committee think it would be only fair to those officers that they should be offered an equivalent career elsewhere, or, in the last resort, that they should be allowed to retire on such pension as the Secretary of State in Council may consider suitable to their period of service.”

That proposal was the bare minimum of justice. It is not at all generous compared with the treatment which has been sanctioned for officials who will be retired from the Service under the Government of Ireland Act, and compared with what is suggested in the Milner Report for British officers in the Egyptian Service.

But the worst of it is, that the Secretary of State is generally credited, rightly or wrongly, with a desire to discount even

this bare minimum of justice. Instead of acting in the spirit of the recommendation of the Joint Committee, he wishes (so it is said) to take an arbitrary and narrow interpretation of the letter only of that recommendation, instead of the spirit. He has read that recommendation to mean that he personally is to decide in each individual case. Officials in India who feel that they cannot usefully take part in the new scheme, and have asked for information in regard to the proportionate pension on which they might retire, have been told that no general scale will be laid down, and that the application will not be considered until it has been made clear to the Secretary of State by actual practice that the applicant cannot usefully continue to serve under the new conditions.

Your Lordships must agree with me that that is an intolerable condition, and one which is contrary to all the customs and traditions of our public Services. We have never entrusted such power to any individual, however eminent. The conditions of entry into the public Service, of service and, except in the case of flagrant conduct, of retirement, have always been governed by statutory Rules and Regulations, and thus placed beyond the arbitrary decision or the possible caprice of any individual in authority. No official will run the risk of being placed, so to speak, in the black book of the Secretary of State if his application to retire should not happen to find favour. It is easy to imagine what the fate of such an official would be. Your Lordships, no doubt, fully understand the kind of circumstances in which a British officer might find his position in India unendurable.

I dare say that many of your Lordships have heard from your friends in India what those circumstances and conditions are. To explain such circumstances in full and in writing might be a matter of exceeding delicacy, involving criticism of other officials both superior and subordinate. No man would care to submit to an inquisition of that kind, and no man ought to be subjected to such an inquisition, unless he has to answer for misconduct before a court of justice. But this is not a case of misconduct. This is the case of men who have done honourable service and who, as the conditions under which they are serving are changed, have every right to be allowed to retire, without loss to their professional careers and their personal means. The case of an officer who does not get on in his regiment—the

Lord Amptill.

kind of case with which your Lordships are familiar—affords a somewhat similar example of the kind of questions which would certainly arise. Englishmen dislike to see dirty linen washed in public, and there is a wise French saying, for which I know of no exact equivalent in English: *Toutes les vérités ne sont pas bonnes à dire*. Although we have no such saying it is a fortunate fact that we are all guided by that maxim in our public life, and it would be utterly lamentable, as well as unfair, if public officers were to be forced to make revelation of their opinions to those under whom they serve, or with whom they serve or over whom they are placed, in order to justify their claim for retirement.

The whole idea is un-English, illiberal, and reactionary. It savours of that "horriddest arbitrariness"—if I may use the famous phrase of Oliver Cromwell—of which, in these modern times, only Radicals dressed in a little brief authority are capable. Unless some definite Regulations and conditions for premature retirement are laid down you will place your officials in India—the men who, according to the Joint Committee, "have deserved the admiration and gratitude of the whole Empire"—in a cruel dilemma. They will either have to render unwilling service, a position intolerable for them and bad for the Administration, or they will have to act in such a way as to get their retirement on grounds of unfitness. That is a very cruel position in which to place faithful servants of the Empire and of India.

I would beg your Lordships to bear in mind that I am not speaking only of those officials, comparatively few in number, who frankly express their dislike of the new policy. I am also speaking of the vast number of officials who accepted the changes with cheerful loyalty and began at once to play up for the reform scheme and to do their best for it. It is these men, the men who have been doing their utmost to make the reform scheme a success, who are now filled with surprise, dismay, and alarm at the hostility which is being manifested towards them. I will not take up your Lordships' time by giving specific instances or illustrations; I will only say that these men are being made to feel in every possible way that India does not want them and that the sooner they clear out the better.

But, for the present at any rate, India cannot do without the British members of those splendid public Services with whose

work nothing in the world can compare. The Leader of the House, in moving the Second Reading of the Government of India Bill, laid down certain essential conditions of reform, of which two are as follows :—Firstly, that nothing should be done to weaken the protection given by the British *Raj* to the vast multitudes to whom the franchise and the vote meant nothing: secondly, that there should be no lowering of the standard of the Civil Service, whose work in the past has enabled India to take the place she now occupies in the Empire and the world. These two conditions hang together. They are manifestly interdependent; for the welfare of the masses must depend, for many years if not indeed for generations to come, upon the efficiency of the Services. If you drive away the present officials by making their lot unendurable you will not get equally good men to go out from this country to succeed them and take their places, and the Services will inevitably deteriorate.

Your treatment of British officials in India is, therefore, the test of your sincerity so far as you profess to desire and to be working for the welfare of the peoples of India. Unless you support your faithful servants and loyal adherents you will lose them, and at the same time you will not gain those of other categories whom you are seeking to propitiate. Although our domestic pre-occupations at the present time are grave and anxious, numerous and overwhelming, we cannot afford to keep our public servants in India in suspense any longer. The delay in this matter has been disgraceful to the Government.

LORD SYDENHAM; My Lords, may I, as a member of the Joint Select Committee, add a few words to what has been said by my noble friend? The Committee was, I believe, perfectly unanimous as regards the principle which my noble friend has brought before the House and certainly expected that the Secretary of State, himself a member of the Committee, would accept it and act upon it at once. But the noble Lord who rendered so much assistance to the Secretary of State during the proceedings of the Committee has told us that the Government of India wished to apply this principle not only to the Indian Civil Service but to the other great Services of the Crown in India. I am sorry that the noble Lord is not in his place to-day to take his part in upholding the cause of those Services.

So far, the Secretary of State has done nothing to carry out this principle to which he, as a member of the Committee, assented. Nothing has been done, I think, except that the Secretary of State said in the House of Commons that he was prepared to consider case by case the instances that were brought to him of the people who wished to retire, and that only one such case, as I think my noble friend said, had been brought to his notice. He has shown that that sort of examination of each case is absolutely impossible. I am sure your Lordships will agree that this question, this really great grievance, can only be dealt with by rule and regulation and not by inquiry into specific cases. You cannot inquire into the motives of men, nor can you possibly investigate and analyse the consciences of individuals.

My noble friend quoted what was said by the noble Marquess the Leader of the House. There were other conditions which the noble Marquess laid down with which, he said, the Bill should comply. Those conditions were ignored just as much as this one has been. I pointed out at the time that under the terms of the Bill, when it came into operation, the Indian Civil Service would be doomed, and that, I think, is becoming more and more clear every day. Having seen their work in India I regard the Indian Civil Service as the finest administrative body we have ever created, and when it passes, as it assuredly will, our wonderful work in India will begin to crumble to pieces. The noble Lord the Under-Secretary for India appears to think that I exaggerate very much the situation and the tendencies in India. I sincerely hope that he is right and I am quite wrong, but I can only say that the information I am constantly receiving from Indians and Europeans shows me that the situation is one of increasing gravity. I should not be in order to-day in trying to prove that statement, but I sincerely hope that the state of India will be fully discussed in your Lordships' House during the next session.

The Indian Civil Service is now loyally striving to do its duty in most difficult conditions. I would point out that it has been the subject of vile attacks and that every effort is being made to destroy its influence with the people of India. The annual touring of our district officers was one of the best means of bringing them into close touch with the real people, and of enabling them to administer justice on

the spot and to remedy and remove all sorts of small grievances in village life. In some parts of India this touring has now become impossible because the villagers, who were perfectly friendly a short time ago, now boycott the district officers and refuse to give them any supplies. Most of our civil servants, the elder ones especially, are finding that the conditions under which they entered the Service have become completely changed. They have been, of course, or some of them have been, accustomed for a long time to serving under Indians, but those are Indians trained in the Service, who have learned its high traditions, and always in the past those civil servants had the protection of someone of their own race, with the Governor or Lieutenant-Governor behind to whom they could appeal.

All that is changed now by the application of the diarchical system to India. The trained and experienced civil servant may find that he has now to do all his work under an inexperienced politician who may have acquired office by his known hostility to the Government of India. One of these politicians lately sent to the subordinates of a senior civil servant to inquire from them what sort of a man he was, and what he was doing. That is the sort of thing which no British officer will stand. It is what my noble friend has described as "the limit." Nor can British officers be expected to look on while corruption and jobbery raise their heads, as is now happening in many parts of India.

There have been some startling cases of the removal of our officials, in obedience either to political clamour or to some secret influences, and I am afraid it is the case that some of them now do not feel full confidence in the Government to defend them if attacked, and to right them if they are wronged. It is part of the policy of ceasing to govern, which is leading towards disaster. Because of that policy our officials and friends in India are being discouraged and intimidated. Hostility to the Government brings rewards or concessions, and sometimes both. A very able Indian editor, who wrote to me by the last mail, says this:

"The policy of the Government is to give the cold shoulder to their supporters, and to do anything to win the good will of their antagonists."

That is the policy which is threatening India with chaos. We can do nothing now to build up the great Services which are shaken to their foundations. But for

Lord Sydenham.

those Services, let us remember, India would now be in a state as bad as that of Persia, which the noble Marquess described to us the other day.

We can relieve such of the public servants as find their position has become impossible, or incompatible with their sense of personal honour. I hope that the noble Earl will be able to say that the principle which the Joint Committee unanimously adopted will be acted upon without further delay, and that he will be able to add that he will apply it also to the other great public Services—engineering, education and medical—which are now finding the same troubles before them. I may point out that the late Viceroy's Government was willing and anxious to apply the same terms to those other great Services.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (THE EARL OF LYTTON): My Lords, I can, of course, give a reply only to the specific Question which my noble friend has put upon the Paper, and it is an unqualified affirmative. His Majesty's Government do certainly accept the principle advocated both by the Government of India and the Joint Select Committee, that members of the public Service in India should, in certain circumstances, be permitted to retire on proportional pension. The Secretary of State has already announced, in the House of Commons, his agreement with that principle.

It is not, I hope, necessary for me to say anything in defence of the Civil Service in India, but I agree entirely with what Lord Sydenham has said, that this is probably the finest administrative body in the world, and I yield to no one in my admiration of the splendid individuals who form that great Service. Indeed, I believe my noble friend, Lord Amptill, is doing them an injustice if he thinks that there is in that splendid body any large number of individuals who will be induced to surrender their work and retire from the Service merely because they are unpopular, or criticised, or because their difficulties are increased. But I agree with him—and on this, I think, there is no difference of opinion in any quarter—that men who strongly and conscientiously disagree with the present policy of the Government ought not to be forced to remain in the Service, and I also agree with him that those who take that view should be given an opportunity of retiring, and, if they do express a

wish to retire, that they should be entitled to receive a proper portion of the pension which they have earned to date. On that point I do not think there is any difference of opinion in any quarter.

I should like to assure my noble friend that there is no foundation whatever for the views which he has heard, by rumour, attributed to the Secretary of State on this matter. If I may make the suggestion to him, I would strongly urge him not to be too ready to believe insinuations of this kind before there is some justification for them. On the question of delay, I think there is just ground for criticism. It is true, as my noble friend has suggested, that in the first instance the Secretary of State imagined that the best way of carrying out the recommendation of the Joint Committee would be to apply the principle which they recommended to every case when it is brought to his notice, but, as my noble friend has pointed out in his speech to your Lordships this afternoon, there is undoubtedly a strong case for dealing with the question as a whole by Regulation.

What I told my noble friend in my letter to him was that I could not give him any general statement to-day as to what the exact terms and details and conditions of such a Regulation would be. That matter has been referred to the Government of India for their decision, and we are, at this moment, awaiting their reply, but as soon as the reply is received, and the Government of India and the Secretary of State are in agreement as to what the terms and conditions of such a Regulation shall be, the Secretary of State will take the first opportunity of making them public.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 18th October, 1921.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

THE WASHINGTON CONFERENCE.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (THE MARQUESS CURZON OF KEDLESTON): My Lords, it will probably be for the convenience of your Lordships' House that I should make a brief statement about the course of business. When we separated at the end of August a purely arbitrary date was fixed in the middle of October at which the adjournment should end in case a resumption of our business was required because of the condition of public affairs. At that time, as your Lordships will remember,

it was contemplated that the subject which might bring us again together in the autumn would be the condition of Ireland, and it may well be that before the year is ended, or at any rate not long afterwards, your Lordships may be discussing that matter.

In the interval, however, the unemployment problem, already serious, has become more acute and has reached a stage at which it clearly demands the sustained attention of the Government and the co-operation of Parliament. We have, therefore, taken advantage of the adjournment till to-day to ask both Houses of Parliament to reassemble in order to discuss this question and to hear the proposals of the Government upon it. It is proposed to devote this part of the session, so far as legislation is concerned, exclusively to that matter. That is to say, no legislation dealing with other subjects will be laid before either House of Parliament by the Government.

As regards the unemployment problem itself this is dealt with partly by administrative methods and partly by the contemplated legislation to which I refer. It would be premature at this stage to indicate the exact nature of the proposals it is proposed to introduce, but they will be in all probability four in number. With respect to some of them Resolutions have to be introduced into the House of Commons before the Bills themselves are brought forward, and I do not anticipate that any of these Bills will be in a position to reach your Lordships' House until the middle of next week at the earliest. A full statement with regard to them will be made by the Prime Minister in another place to-morrow. It is not in my power, and if it were it would not be right for me, to anticipate that to-day, and as regards the character and details of the measures themselves I think your Lordships will prefer to await the occasion when they come in a more mature form before you rather than have what could only be an unsatisfactory and a premature discussion at an earlier stage.

With reference to other matters outside the sphere of legislation, of course, while your Lordships' House is sitting, this bench, and I in particular, will be at your disposal for any subject about which you may solicit information. I do not know what are the desires of your Lordships' House in that respect, but my own inclination would be to suggest that in view of the circumstances that I have described

your Lordships would do well to adjourn for a week, let us say, unless any noble Lord desires to raise a discussion on any matter of importance in the interval. Should the latter be the case we shall be ready to meet him, but in the period over which the session lasts, which I think is likely to be between two and three weeks—probably nearer three weeks than two—should we adjourn now for a week there will still be an ample opportunity for this bench to give your Lordships information on any other matter of public interest concerning which you may desire it. So much for public business.

Your Lordships will, I think, expect me to take advantage of the present opportunity to make a public announcement on a matter concerning which information has already appeared to some extent in the Press—namely, the composition of the British delegation at Washington. Every section of public opinion in the country has witnessed with extreme satisfaction the announcement that the Prime Minister himself proposes, should Parliamentary and general political conditions permit of it, to go at the head of the British delegation to Washington. He will be accompanied by Mr. Balfour and Lord Lee of Fareham, as representing the Admiralty. I am sure your Lordships will join with me in a tribute of formal gratitude to Mr. Balfour for being willing, in addition to the many public labours that he has recently undertaken, to add this further service, and you will recognise, in view not only of his position and prestige at home but of the almost unexampled influence that he acquired during his visit to America when she entered the war, that no more fitting exponent of British views than he could possibly have been found.

From many points of view I should like, as Foreign Secretary, to have gone to Washington myself. The problems of the Far East and the Pacific are questions which in the course of my public life I have had many occasions to study and I have several times also visited those regions. But your Lordships will, I think, understand that in the present position of affairs it is well-nigh impossible for the head of the Foreign Office to be absent from this country for any length of time, and that the Conference itself is not likely to be short. Further, I happen to be engaged at the moment in the conduct of negotiations or inquiries of some importance which it is quite impossible for me to

suspend. I should further have liked to be present because I am one of those who entertain the most confident hope that there lies in the possession of this Conference the material for arriving at an honourable and a happy solution of the very difficult questions arising out of the Far East and the Pacific, and I should dearly have liked to join in the effort to bring its labours to a successful conclusion. However, I have had to put these personal wishes in the background.

As regards the other members of the delegation, should the Prime Minister not be able to attend at the start or should he or any other of the delegates be prevented from attending at any other period during the Conference, the place so vacant will be taken by Sir Auckland Geddes, the British Ambassador at Washington. As regards the Dominions and India, it was arranged at the recent Imperial Conference that His Majesty's Government should represent the whole Empire at Washington. In view, however, of the vital importance of the subjects to be considered at the Conference on Disarmament, it was felt to be very desirable that the Dominions should be represented by their Prime Ministers themselves, or, if this proved impossible, by persons nominated by them. None of the Prime Ministers of the Dominions has found it possible to attend in person, and the following have been nominated to represent their respective Dominions on the British Empire Delegation—Sir Robert Borden, for Canada; Senator Pearce, for Australia; Sir John Salmond, for New Zealand; and Mr. Srinivasa Sastri, for India. General Smuts has decided to leave the interests of the Union to the representative of the British Government, who were made fully acquainted with his views at the recent Imperial Conference. Admiral of the Fleet Earl Beatty will be the senior British naval expert at the outset of the Conference, and will be succeeded in due course by Admiral Chatfield. General Lord Cavan will be the principal military expert, and Air Vice-Marshal Higgins will represent the Air Minister. Sir Maurice Hankey will be the British Secretary of the British Empire Delegation.

That is, I think, the sum and substance of the communication I have to make to your Lordships about the Conference, and it only remains for me in resuming my seat to express, as I am sure I may on behalf of the whole House, our earnest wishes of

The Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.

success for our representatives at what will certainly be one of the most momentous international meetings that have ever taken place, and our confident hopes that, under the guidance of Providence and with the co-operation of the statesmen who will be assembled at Washington from all parts of the world, results may be obtained which will enure to the general peace and welfare of mankind.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 25th October, 1921.

SITUATION IN INDIA.

LORD SYDENHAM rose to draw attention to the situation in India. The noble Lord said: My Lords, any one who has tried to follow events in India during the past five years must realise that the situation has grown steadily more menacing, and the causes of that, I think, are perfectly clear. Since the present Secretary of State took office we have had a long series, a disastrous series, of mistakes, illusions, concessions, and vain attempts to create an artificial atmosphere favourable to impossible policies. And that it is which has led to the weakening of our authority in India. In addition, the effect of the war has been felt throughout India. It added to the general unrest and, perhaps more, added to the general proneness to unrest. But the start of the violent movements which seem almost to have passed beyond control was most carefully selected.

In September, 1916, at one of the most critical phases of the war, Mrs. Besant started her Home Rule League at Madras. A month later nineteen members of the Viceroy's Council suddenly formulated the crazy Constitution and flung it at the head of the Government. In December, Tilak, with Mrs. Besant's assistance, captured the National Congress, which became immediately allied with the Moslem League, and, since then, has been the mainspring of a movement directed to wrecking our rule in India. I recall these facts because they are already forgotten, and it is very often said that all the concessions we have made were more than justified by the wonderful rally of India to the cause of the Empire during the war. It is true that the Princes and Chiefs and all the fighting castes of India behaved splendidly and gave fine proofs of their loyalty. It is also true that many Indians did valuable voluntary war work. But the little politically-minded class

which alone demanded instant and immediate concessions took advantage of our peril and continued till the war ended to embarrass the Government as far as lay in its power.

In July, 1917, when it was becoming clear that the greatest of the Allied Armies was breaking up, the Joint Conference of the Congress and the Moslem League imperiously demanded that a pledge should at once be given that India would be made self-governing and also that Mrs. Besant should be released from her very comfortable internment. A resolution was passed at the same time suggesting passive resistance to all political work in the Councils, and that is really the germ of the Non-cooperation movement which has now assumed dangerous dimensions in India. On August 20 the Secretary of State replied to all this by the announcement of what was falsely called a new policy. That policy was at least as old as 1858. The Morley-Minto reforms had not been in operation for ten years and they were working exceedingly well. The Indianisation of the public Service was going on at a rapid pace, and more and more power was being conferred upon Indian bodies. Soon after this announcement Mrs. Besant was released at the instance of the Secretary of State and in opposition to the wishes of the Government of Madras, and she immediately announced her intention of creating a calm atmosphere which does not ever appear to have shown itself.

Now it is the manner and the time of this announcement and, more especially, the means taken to give it effect which form, in my opinion, the first act in the tragedy of errors in India. Agitation was powerfully stimulated. If so much could be conceded to Mrs. Besant and her extremist friends, in the throes of a great war, how much more might not be obtained by intensified efforts in times of peace? After that the Secretary of State, as we all remember, toured some of the great towns of India and interviewed a number of the leading politicians. Then came the celebrated Joint Report which, I think, was one of the most remarkable State Papers ever issued. It admirably described the populations of India as "marching in uneven stages through all the centuries from the fifth to the twentieth," but it did not go on to point out that the marchers in the twentieth were a mere handful and that the great mass of the people had not yet reached the sixteenth century, though

it did admit that 95 per cent. of the people had no interest whatever in any political question. Then it went on to formulate a full-blown democratic Constitution and it proposed deliberately to disturb the placid contentment of the people of India. The authors of that Report made one fundamental mistake and that was of finding the political centre of gravity of India in what they rightly called "the limited *intelligentsia*." They ignored the great fact—the greatest fact in India—that it is only the tens of millions of workers on the land who really count in the long run and that no policy not designed for their welfare and suited to their conditions can possibly prove successful. Gandhi did not make that mistake, and he knows perfectly well how to make use of these credulous, excitable millions whom he has now promised to release from the oppression of the "Satanic" Government.

The Report was debated in your Lordships' House on October 23 and 24, 1918, and its principal features were very strongly condemned. The noble Marquess, Lord Lansdowne, said—

"I profoundly distrust the idea of imposing Western democratic institutions on a motley congeries of peoples who have nothing in common, or very little in common, except that they are Eastern and not Western peoples."

He went on to point out that the Indian Civil Service was "very likely to be done to death politically." The noble Earl, Lord Selborne, on that occasion, said—

"What I want to point out is the tremendous danger in too abrupt a transition from one form of government to another."

He added this—

"I am quite sure that none of your Lordships can have read this Report without feeling that some of the proposals cannot stand."

I have looked through all the debates on this subject in your Lordships' House, and I think I can say that nothing has since happened of which plain warning was not given, but all those warnings were disregarded. The Secretary of State persisted in his illusions, and the Bill was rushed through Parliament at headlong speed after the position of the Supreme Government had been weakened by the Select Committee. Three of the conditions on which the noble Marquess the Leader of the House laid great stress were absolutely ignored. That was the second act of the tragedy.

Meanwhile, other warnings of a very different kind were forthcoming. In October, 1917, a well-organised attack of Hindus

on Mahomedans in Behar took place. The riots extended over a large area and lasted some days. Many people were killed and British troops had to be used to restore order. That happened while the Congress of the Moslem League was holding conferences to secure joint action against our Government. That shows how very small the margin is in India between peace and disorder. A year later a similar atrocious attack by Hindus took place at Katurpur and on that occasion several Mahomedans were actually burned alive. The publication of the Rowlatt Report unfortunately followed that of the Joint Report on which it has a most important bearing. The Rowlatt Report throws a flood of light upon the secret conspiracies in India with their ramifications all over the world. Very few people read this Report and when, after two conspiracies had been discovered in the Punjab, an open rebellion broke out in April, 1919, the situation was not in the least realised in this country. It was a large rising and one more completely organised than the Mutiny, and it was suppressed by the Punjab Government with a total loss of life of 450. The Malabar rising has already cost 2,000 lives, not including the lives of the murdered Hindus, the numbers of whom will probably never be ascertained.

What followed was debated for two days in your Lordships' House and your Lordships, by a large majority, condemned the proceedings of the Secretary of State and the Government of India. The Hunter Committee began to sit too late, after intimidation had been brought to bear upon the witnesses by the authors of the rebellion. It declined to take some essential evidence and it permitted the grossly unfair cross-examination of General Dyer. For these reasons it failed to bring out the essential facts, but the treatment of the officials who had tried to do their duty in most difficult circumstances had the most deplorable effect throughout India. All the leading criminals, including those responsible for the loss of life at Amritsar, were quickly amnestied and most of them resumed their former activities. The agitators took their cue from the Government and violently attacked the officials who suppressed the rebellion and the Indians who helped them to do so. The officials learned a bitter lesson—that they could not count upon the support of their Government.

Lord Sydenham.

The direct results of all this were very remarkable. The official apology which was extracted from the Government of India at a later period was circulated broadcast all through Malabar, with comments in order to encourage the rising of the Moplahs. Two officers of the Leinster regiment were hacked to pieces because they did not open fire in time, and it was pointed out in your Lordships' House that such an occurrence was probable. The handling of the Punjab rebellion was in my opinion the third act in the tragedy of India. All through 1919 disorder prevailed in many parts and it was widely proclaimed that the *Raj* was coming to an end. Last year, therefore, found the Government of India in a very difficult position because it was considered necessary to create a favourable atmosphere for the coming Election.

Now we have, fortunately, an official description of the policy of the Secretary of State and the Government of India in the Report of Mr. Rushbrook Williams. It says this—

"The Government realise that it is to enlightened public opinion they must chiefly trust for a dissipation of the danger that now envelops India, as it is on that same public opinion that India's political future must depend. It is in this trust that they have refrained in the past, so far as is consistent with the public safety, from repressive action, for they consider that such action should only be employed in the last resort, when indeed a failure to adopt it would be a criminal betrayal of the people."

The idea of taking measures only "in the last resort" in such a country as India is obviously fatal, and it is certain to lead, as it has led, to a very great loss of life. The "betrayal" of wretched people who have been robbed and murdered has actually occurred.

In this House the Under-Secretary of State, a little more than a year ago, defined the policy of the India Office as regards agitation. He said—

"Do not interfere too hastily or too violently with an agitation of this nature; let it kill itself, as in time it does."

I hope the Governor of Behar and Orissa knows better now. Even the ordinary law against sedition was not enforced in 1920, until, in March, trouble seemed to be again imminent in the Punjab. Then some mild measures were adopted in a few districts, and two Indian members of the Assembly, to their great credit, strongly supported the Government. One of them said—

"How are the minds of the people being poisoned? No Government worth its salt can tolerate such a thing."

All the offenders convicted on that occasion have since been released. In full accordance with the policy of "the last resort," the Ali brothers were not re-arrested until they had done irremediable harm and had been able to engineer the Moplah rebellion.

The Elections in 1920 demonstrated conclusively the unfitness of India for the new Constitution. Of the voters for the Assembly only one-fifth went to the poll, and of those for the Provincial Councils only one-fourth. Of these small minorities many people had not the slightest idea what it was all about. These new bodies, therefore, only represent a section of the politically-minded classes and they are quite out of sympathy with the two hundred millions of the cultivators of India. Already lawyers and *baniyas* in the Punjab Provincial Council want to repeal the Land Alienation Act which is one of the principal safeguards of the *ryots*. The main political feature of the Elections was that they were boycotted by the dominant political Party which enabled a certain number of Moderates to obtain seats. We have, therefore, handed over immense powers to a little oligarchy on the plea of conferring upon India the blessings of democracy.

The general effect of the birth of the Constitution was a great increase of organised agitation against British rule and Europeans, and it is that which has led to most deplorable incidents throughout the length and breadth of India. The Gandhi Non-cooperation movement and the Caliphate movement have gone on hand in hand, though the two great communities have nothing in common, as the latest attack on Hindus by Mahomedans again proves. We have been frequently told that the Non-cooperation movement was on the point of collapse, and in some respects it was certain to break down. The Indian lawyers would not give up their practice in British Courts and Indian officials would not resign their seats. Gandhi, therefore, began to address himself to the preaching of race hatred and contempt among the masses themselves, and any one who knows India can conceive the terrible possibilities of teaching of that kind.

The Moplah rebellion, which I regard as the fourth act of the tragedy, remains to be suppressed, and the difficulties are considerable in so tangled a country. It was a well-organised rebellion, and one organised under the eyes of the Government. The preparations had been going

on for some time. The other day the noble Earl charged me with exaggerating the gravity of the situation. Hardly more than a week later the rebellion broke out, and the India Office and the Government of India must have known that it was then imminent. The district conference of May, 1920, gave ample warning. Violent speeches were made. The extremists carried the day and the Caliphate volunteers started a systematic propaganda in every village. Fifteen months later the storm burst. These poor fanatics had been told that British rule had disappeared and that the Ali brothers had been established; and they had some reason to believe that it was true.

They are now experimenting in self-determination, and the result is a shocking loss of life which might easily have been prevented by a Government which really governed. The only bright feature I can find is the fine behaviour of the district officers and police which I believe saved Calicut from a great massacre. Some of the Moplahs proved staunch but demobilised soldiers ranged themselves with the rebels and, of course, their training was useful to the rebellion.

While the Civil administration appeared to grow weaker a deadly blow to our system of justice was delivered by the sudden abandonment of the prosecution of Messrs. Kernani and Bannerjee. I cannot give the details, which are still somewhat obscure, but nothing has caused greater indignation throughout India among all Europeans and among a large number of Indians. A large sum was spent in getting up the case and the Advocate-General of Bengal stated in Court that he believed it was complete. Rumours had been started, and, in February, the Minister of Commerce and Industry was asked in the Assembly if the prosecution was about to be withdrawn, and he replied that he knew of no such decision. The plea was that if these persons were convicted the shareholders in their businesses would suffer pecuniary loss. That plea conflicts with the whole theory of British justice, and the effect was to saddle upon India a scandal of the Marconi type. I hope the noble Earl will tell the House the total sum involved in the alleged frauds on the Munitions Board, the number of concerns with which the accused were connected, and whether the prosecution of the European subordinates is to be continued while the principals have gone free.

Lord Sydenham.

What is the present situation in India which I have ventured to describe as a tragedy? I can only describe it very briefly as it appears to me, and I hope my view is wrong. For the reasons I have given all authority has certainly weakened throughout India, and it is widely believed by the masses that our rule is either ended or is shortly coming to an end. The latest demands from the advanced members of the Assembly are that diarchy, which has proved quite unworkable in the Provinces, should be applied to the supreme Government and that the Provinces should be made completely autonomous next year, full Dominion Home Rule to be given at the end of the fourth session of the Assembly. That means the scrapping of the Government of India Act, and is a direct challenge to the authority of Parliament. It is hoped and believed that such a ferment can be created in India as to secure these further concessions. From the Southern State of Travancore right up to the little States in the Simla Hills, disorders, large or small, are now constantly breaking out. Political strikes are frequent in all the great industrial centres, and they are nearly always accompanied by some loss of life. Shameful intimidation is going on even in remote country districts. The boycott of Europeans in the country districts is still being carried on, and insulting behaviour to our men and women in India tends to increase. Our failure to maintain law and order explains all these and some other very serious symptoms. Reliance upon public opinion, or upon Moderates who do not really count, to help us in this primary duty has proved perfectly futile.

In the East, a Government which is once believed to have lost its strength also loses all its best friends. Sir Verney Lovett has put that vital matter in two pregnant sentences—

“ We shall not understand Indian affairs unless we realise that peace and order in the great sub-continent depend principally upon the prestige of the Central Administration, upon the honour or dishonour which attaches to the British name in India. Whatever may take the place of that prestige in the future, there is nothing whatever that can take its place to-day.”

In the past law and order have been maintained, not only by military force but mainly by the personal qualities and the personal influence of our district officers among the masses of India, and that influence and that prestige are tending

unquestionably to be destroyed. The great Services which have made India what she is are at the present moment visibly crumbling away. Members of the Indian Civil Service have felt it their duty to warn young men against coming to India. It was realised that their position might be difficult, and measures were proposed for giving them their release, but up to the present nothing whatever has been done in that direction. At the last open competition held in London, of nineteen successful candidates only three were British. The recruitment for the Medical Service and for the Police is becoming more and more difficult. The fact is that the great Services are becoming disheartened, and are tending to wither away. There is nothing whatever that can take their place in India. Already corruption is showing itself in many places, and the real people of India will find out before long what lies before them.

I turn to the military situation. I must not repeat what I said in this House a short time ago. Eighteen fine Cavalry regiments have been destroyed or are being destroyed, and what the reduction in the Infantry is going to be I do not know. The British Forces in India have been much reduced, and the Commander-in-Chief lately explained that this was the reason for the withdrawal of the detachment at Malapuram. It was here that the Moplah rebellion first broke out. More reductions of the military forces are demanded, but I understand that the Viceroy has said that he will not countenance any further reduction of the British Forces, and I am very thankful to hear that. Last year the general lawlessness on the North-west Frontier was greater than it has been at any time since we went there. What will come out of the nine months of these protracted negotiations at Kabul no one can tell. There surely was never a time when a reduction of military strength was so dangerous and so inopportune.

The loyalty of the Indian Army is being very sorely tried. Gandhi has recently proclaimed in his paper that

"The National Congress began to tamper with the loyalty of the sepoy in September of last year, that the Central Caliphate Committee began it earlier, and that I began it earlier still."

He added—

"We must reiterate from a thousand platforms this formula of the Ali brothers regarding the sepoys, and we must spread disaffection openly and systematically until it pleases the Government to arrest us."

What must be thought in the bazaars of a Government which does not take up a challenge of that kind? If the Indian Army remains true, as I believe it will, under the great pressure which is now being brought to bear upon it, the reason will be the affection and confidence which are inspired by the British officers of that Army, and if we ever come down to the type of officers, native or British, who are not real leaders of men, that Army will be in the gravest possible danger. But there is another possibility in the future. The fighting classes of India will never accept the governance of the limited *intelligentsia*, which they always despise. Under Home Rule we must either retain complete control over the Army, which, I think, would be quite impracticable, or the Army will break up and pass into the hands of Indian leaders who can offer it good terms, and then the India of pre-British days will quickly return.

It is frequently forgotten that one-third of India is governed by hereditary Princes and Chiefs. How will the democratic Constitution affect them? They must know, and they do know, that the methods successfully adopted in India will be relentlessly applied to them as soon as it becomes possible. They will have to face what our officials have to face now, a campaign of lies and abuse. Some of them, I know, have already to face these campaigns, but the more powerful Chiefs have sternly forbidden agitators to enter their territories. I read in the paper yesterday that there has been a rush of fugitives from Malabar into the native State of Cochin, because they think that they can find security under native rule. The British Resident in Hyderabad and his wife were pelted with mud the other day. That, however, did not occur in the territory ruled over by the Nizam, but in the British enclave of Secunderabad, one of the great cantonments of India.

Some of the smaller States have already been the scene of organised riots. One of their Chiefs wrote to me the other day—

"Notwithstanding my having prohibited the holding of public meetings, secret night meetings were held, and for nine to ten months the situation was simply alarming. The agitators in British India jump from one conclusion to another. Their proceedings are so subtle that the effect is quite otherwise than what is disclosed by their pretensions, and their doings are more or less reflected in native States. I do not understand how long the Government is going to be silent over such a condition of suspense."

These chiefs, like the loyalists of Southern Ireland, feel that they are being abandoned by a Government which professes to protect them. In some quarters I know that there is hope that the new Councils will in time rise to a full sense of their responsibilities, and prove helpful to the Government in the maintenance of order. I am afraid I can see nothing to justify such hopes. Most of the Councils have constituted themselves already as an opposition to all Government measures, and they have bitterly criticised Government servants. In Bengal there was an attempt to cut down the Police vote, which could only be avoided by the expressed decision of the Governor to exercise his veto. Other Councils have shown a distinctly anti-British spirit, and are able to intimidate the Moderate members, who might co-operate with us if they were not afraid to do so. What will happen when the extremists take possession and form majorities on these Councils can easily be imagined.

In the municipal field, hostility to us, incompetence and corruption are growing steadily. The almost Bolshevik Municipal Council of Lahore recently ordered the Superintendent of the Fire Brigade, who was an ex-British soldier, to wear the Gandhi uniform, which forced him, of course, to resign his appointment. The Amritsar municipality is now spending 54,000 rupees a year to administer 26,000 rupees. Sanitation and roads, I am told, are getting into a shocking condition. Another municipal council has abolished Western medicine and restored the Ayurvedic and Unani systems. Education is disordered almost all over India. In Bengal there is a reduction of 42 per cent. in the number of collegiate students, and nearly 50,000 boys have disappeared from the recognised schools. This is entirely due to Gandhi's propaganda, and wherever the hand of the Government has been removed, or appeared to weaken, there are signs of a reversion to the pre-British conditions which Mrs. Besant once described as "Heaven."

But the outstanding result of all our concessions and amnesties, and neglect to enforce the law, has been to produce race hatred to an extent never before known. That is also exactly like the case of Ireland, which was peaceable, most prosperous and not unfriendly before the advent of Mr. Birrell. By showing weakness and fear we have already alienated many of our strongest supporters. A loyal and distinguished Indian lately wrote:—

Lord Sydenham.

"It is getting clear every day that all those who stood for Government, when it was a power, have been absolutely left in the lurch, and all enemies of Government have been brought to the forefront. I would have always stuck to the Government. But when there is no Government left, or whatever it is has joined its own enemies, one would have to be against the Government if one was against its enemies. . . . Under these unique circumstances we are seriously thinking of joining the Congress."

I know of other loyal Indians who are thinking the same way and one can well fancy a South Ireland loyalist having the same feeling. The saddest feature in the situation is the continuous loss of Indian lives, which goes on at short intervals and threatens before long to assume large dimensions. The people who believe that law ought not to be enforced if there is any risk of loss of life are always the cause of heavy losses of life in the long run.

I do not underrate for a moment the great difficulties of the Government, the pressure brought to bear upon them here and in India, the deadly influence of paid propaganda, and the reaction upon India of the revolutionaries in Russia and Ireland. But my own experience, on a small provincial scale in 1908, taught me that there are elements in India which will rally in support of order, if they believe that the Government only acts for the welfare of the people and is prepared to support those who stand by it. I hope that your Lordships will pardon me if I seem to speak too plainly. I feel strongly that the truth ought to be known, and that it is not known, and I sympathise most deeply with the voiceless masses of India who will be the greatest sufferers in the future, and who have already suffered very severely. Our first duty in India is to maintain law, security and justice. If we fail in that our only justification for being in India is gone. It is my firm belief that authority must be reasserted in India for the sake of the simple, credulous, easily-misguided people who are now being used as pawns by people who are really revolutionaries. I do not know if it is already too late, but it would have been easy not very long ago. If it is too late, then the old question "Can a democracy govern an empire?" will have received a final and decisive answer.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR
FOREIGN AFFAIRS (THE MARQUESS
CURZON OF KEDLESTON): My Lords, I

desire to intervene only for a few minutes at this stage of the discussion, and that for a particular reason, which I will explain to your Lordships. When the noble Marquess, Lord Salisbury, a week ago suggested to me the desirability of having a debate upon India at an early stage, and indicated the possibility of taking that discussion to-day, I gave a provisional assent, subject to consultation with the Secretary of State for India, whom I had not yet seen upon the subject. When I discussed the matter with him I ascertained that, for reasons in which I concurred and which I will presently explain to the House, he thought it very undesirable that the debate, although he did not at all deprecate its taking place in the course of the present session of Parliament, should be held at this moment.

Accordingly, I communicated with my noble friend, Lord Sydenham, to whom I explained the reasons which I had in my mind, and whom I urged to postpone his Question for a short time. It then transpired that the noble Lord, Lord Amthill, had a similar Notice on the Paper. I believe Lord Sydenham communicated with him, and the result of the communication was that neither noble Lord felt disposed to give way, and the Notices have appeared upon the Paper this afternoon. It is not for me in any way to fetter, or even to comment upon, the exercise of independent judgment by those two noble Lords. They are, no doubt, animated by a due sense of their own responsibility, but I must confess that in my experience it is a rather unusual thing—I think I may almost say an unprecedented thing—if a Minister, and perhaps even more if the Leader of the House, asks a noble Lord, not to take his Notice altogether off the Paper, but, for reasons which he gives, to postpone the discussion of it for a few days—I say it is a most unusual thing for that request to be ignored.

Now, my Lords, let me state to the House what were the reasons which I put to my noble friend, Lord Sydenham. They were two in number. I told him that His Majesty's Government is in daily, I might almost say hourly, communication with the Viceroy and with the Government of India, on matters of the utmost importance, but I told him that the state of those communications rendered any definite pronouncement on the matter by the spokesman of the Government premature, and

indeed impossible, and any discussion of the Indian question, in my judgment, unwise and inopportune. I pointed out to him, further, that the Prince of Wales is about to start to-morrow on a journey upon which all our eyes are bent with intense interest and hopeful expectation, and that I should greatly deplore if anything were said, even by accident, even unconsciously, to mar the harmony of his departure. Those considerations did not prevail, but let me say a word about each of them.

As regards the position of the Government, we have just listened for the space of something like forty or forty-five minutes to a description by the noble Lord of the present position in India as he sees it. He has depicted it as a position where the agitators hold the field, where the Government has lost authority and prestige, where the administration of the law has to a large extent ceased to exist, where the Councils set up under the scheme of the Secretary of State and Lord Chelmsford are already proving their failure, where the municipalities are even worse than they have been at any time in their chequered history, where the educational administration has fallen to pieces, and where the relations between the two races in India have reached a pitch of dislocation, if not worse, unprecedented in our history. That is the picture drawn by the noble Lord. I do not propose, after what I have said, to discuss to-day how far it is true. It does not altogether tally with such information as I have upon the subject.

But the point I want to put to your Lordships is this. Does the noble Lord ask your Lordships to believe that he alone is in possession of this information? Is it not perfectly certain that the whole of the conditions in India are not only as well known to the Viceroy and his Council, but must be much better known to them than to any of us here? Is it not the case that the Viceroy and the Government of India alone at the present moment are in a position to estimate the significance of the symptoms to which my noble friend refers? The Viceroy and his Council know whether or not these schemes of the agitators to whom the noble Lord referred are successful. They know better than we do whether the promises of Mr. Gandhi and his friends are in course of being fulfilled, or whether that agitator, having failed, as I believe he did, with the intellectuals, is also in the course

of failure in his appeal to the peasants. They know far better than we can whether the atmosphere in India is that of the dangerous excitement to which the noble Lord referred or whether it is one rather of disappointment and disgust at the failure of the promises of the agitators to materialise.

These considerations the Government of India must balance, and they are balancing them every day. The Viceroy of India, during the last two or three weeks, has been engaged on official duties in Kashmir. He returns this week and he joins his Council at the end of this week. Every one of these matters will come before him and before them on that occasion. So far as we are concerned—and I suppose that the speech of the noble Lord contains some sort of challenge addressed to this bench—the Viceroy is assured, and has been assured, of the complete and unanimous support of the Government in any action that he and his colleagues may choose to take. He has not to wait for orders; he possesses full powers at any day and at any time to act in the manner which he and his colleagues think desirable for the vindication of the law and order which my noble friend seems to think have ceased to exist. But at this moment, in the circumstances which I have described, for your Lordships, even by implication, to interfere, or to dictate, or even to suggest to the Viceroy and his Council that they ought to take this or that action, with the imperfect information at our disposal, and at this great distance of space, would, I submit to your Lordships, be undesirable and unwise.

And, also, a debate in this House is capable of exercising a very unfortunate effect. The noble Lord spoke with a certain amount of moderation of form, and yet I can easily imagine, if sentences from his speech, highly coloured as they were, containing adjectives that did not err on the side of moderation, followed, as it conceivably may be, by speeches of a similar, perhaps of an even more vehement, character—I can easily conceive, if passages from speeches of that nature were transferred on the telegraph wires to India, very likely distorted and exaggerated in the process of transmission, they might produce an effect very different from that which they do in the tranquil atmosphere of your Lordships' House.

There is, further, the second consideration to which I alluded just now. A re-

The Marquess Curzon of Kedleston.

port in India of a debate of the character that I am speaking of in your Lordships' House—which, if I may be allowed to say so in passing, carries great weight in India—may exercise a very deleterious influence at the moment when that tour is beginning to which I referred a few moments ago. To-morrow the Prince of Wales leaves England with the expectation on our part, and, I am sure, with the personal desire on his, of adding materially to the great services which he has already rendered in similar tours in other parts of the world.

NOBLE LORDS: Hear, hear.

THE MARQUESS CURZON OF KEDLESTON: Wherever he has gone he has hitherto been the herald of good understanding and good will, and a harbinger of peace. In India his wonderful and winning personality, his record and his quite uncommon power of speech, wholly apart from his illustrious rank and position, will, I am sure, make a most definite and desirable impression, not only upon the Princes but upon the masses of India. Of course, the question of whether he should go or not is one which has been very seriously considered, and the decision which has been taken that the tour should be proceeded with is one that has been arrived at upon the united advice of the Viceroy and his colleagues. They are prepared to guarantee that every conceivable precaution will be taken, and that nothing will be left to chance.

In these circumstances, my Lords, do let us combine to start this tour, so fraught with great possibilities, in an atmosphere in which there shall not be a single jarring note. It would be a great pity, I think it would be almost a crime, if anything was said here—I do not say it has been said, and I am perfectly convinced it will not be said—to cast any cloud upon the progress of that young Prince in this great Dominion, which, if it proceeds with the *éclat* which has attended his previous journeys, may indeed carry a message of good will and be fraught with much blessing to the Indian Empire.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: My Lords, I do not rise to take part in the Indian part of this very important discussion, but, as my noble friend Lord Sydenham has been in communication with me in reference to the occasion for taking this debate, I feel perhaps it would

be becoming if I explained to your Lordships why, in our humble view, this debate ought to take place. The noble Marquess has said that he thinks it is very unusual that a debate should not be postponed for a few days upon the appeal of the Leader of the House. If the noble Marquess had come forward and said, or had said privately to my noble friend, that he desired this debate should take place in three or four days' time, perhaps a week's time, upon a given day which could be announced to your Lordships, no doubt it would have been our duty to have considered very carefully whether we could not have fallen in with his suggestion. But that, of course, was not what was suggested, and anybody who has listened to the noble Marquess's speech will see that any such limited suggestion that it should be postponed for three or four days to a named day was wholly inconsistent with the whole of his argument.

THE MARQUESS CURZON OF KEDLESTON: No: the noble Lord is not correct. When I communicated with my noble friend I did not suggest that he should take his Notice off the Paper; I suggested that he should leave it on the Paper, and that it should be taken at such time in the present session of Parliament—which, after all, is going to be short—as I should inform him would be in the public interest.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: It was clearly inconsistent with the whole of the tenour of the argument which the noble Marquess has just delivered to the House, for he explained that he thought that in his judgment, in the critical condition of things in India, a debate ought not to take place. What difference would two or three days make if that were so?

THE MARQUESS CURZON OF KEDLESTON: I must be allowed to point out—

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: Perhaps the noble Marquess will allow me to make my own speech.

THE MARQUESS CURZON OF KEDLESTON: Perhaps the noble Marquess will allow me to answer his most unjust remark. The point I made was that, in the first place, at the present

moment His Majesty's Government, owing to the conditions which I have described, were not in a position to make that statement to the House, which they probably would be in a position to make at a rather later date; and, secondly, that a debate taking place on this day, the very day before the Prince of Wales starts on his journey, was unwise and inopportune.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The noble Marquess knows as well as I do that there is nobody in your Lordships' House who does not view with immense sympathy the Prince of Wales's visit to India. We all hope that it may fulfil all expectations, and we are deeply grateful to His Royal Highness for the public service which on repeated occasions he has given to his country.

NOBLE LORDS: Hear, hear.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: It is clear that the Prince of Wales's journey to India is going to last many months; so what real value is there in the argument of the noble Marquess that a postponement of this debate for three or four days would make any difference whatever? No! The whole argument of the noble Marquess—and it was a very legitimate and proper one for him to put forward—was that a debate about the condition of India at the present time would be inopportune, partly with reference to the visit of His Royal Highness and partly with reference to the general condition of India. That brings us to the point as to whether Parliament ought to forego the right of criticism in respect of India at the present moment, and the particular question whether it is to-day, or to-morrow, or two or three days hence, is not relevant to the argument of the noble Marquess to-day. The whole point of his contention was that we must be silent in respect to the condition of India. I am afraid we cannot take that view. We think that the condition of things in India is so grave that a discussion in Parliament must take place. That is what we mean when we speak of a democratic form of government, and we venture to think that such a discussion must take place. Had it been a question of putting the debate off until, let us say, this day week, that would have been a matter for consideration, but the view we take is that the debate ought to take place.

Then it is not only in respect of conditions in India that we receive these private appeals from the noble Marquess, the Leader of the House. I do not think I recollect an important discussion of any kind during the last few years in which there has not been a request from the Government that we should postpone the discussion. It is always taking place. They are perfectly entitled to suggest it, but these appeals do not impress us quite so much as they would do if they were more unusual. It is for these reasons that we thought it necessary to bring on this discussion, but I ought not to resume my seat without saying that I share with the noble Marquess a conviction of the great responsibility which rests upon every member of your Lordships' House to express himself with the greatest care and the greatest caution in respect of these very serious and difficult matters, and I say with great confidence that every member of your Lordships' House will share that view. I am sorry if we have not been able to fall absolutely into line with the wishes of His Majesty's Government, but it is necessary for us to do our duty, just as it is necessary for the Government to do theirs.

THE MARQUESS OF CREWE: My Lords, I had no intention of taking any part in what the noble Marquess, Lord Salisbury, calls the Indian part of this debate because, like the noble Marquess who leads the House, I am sorry that it is taking place to-day. Before Parliament met, my noble friend, Lord Pentland, wrote to me and asked me whether I thought it likely that the Government would be prepared to engage in a debate especially with reference to the condition of affairs in Southern India, and whether I thought they would be willing to make some statement on the subject at the opening of the session. I advised my noble friend to write to the Under-Secretary for India in order to find out whether His Majesty's Government desired to make a statement at present, and I implied to my noble friend, as I think he will agree, that I hoped he would be guided in this matter so far as possible by the views of the India Office. My noble friend did write and received a reply from the noble Earl, Lord Lytton, very much in the sense of what the noble Marquess the Leader of the House has just said. In those circumstances I should not have advised my noble friend to press for a statement at present, and I confess I am sorry

The Marquess of Salisbury.

that the noble Marquess, Lord Salisbury, and his friends have thought it necessary to raise the whole question of administration at this moment.

My noble friend, Lord Sydenham, as the noble Marquess admitted, expressed himself in terms of general moderation, although it cannot be said, I think, that the implications of his speech were in themselves moderate. He seemed to consider that the whole administration of India, principally, of course, that of the Secretary of State—we are all, I think, pretty well aware of the noble Lord's opinion of that member of His Majesty's Government—but the implication was that the Viceroy, the Government, and the Administration generally were not playing their part in maintaining law and order in India; that, guided by the maleficent influences from the India Office, both the civil and military administration in India appeared to be altogether paralysed at this moment. That is the general impression one gained from my noble friend's speech.

Like the noble Marquess opposite, I am sorry that at this moment when His Royal Highness, the Prince of Wales, is starting on that great expedition of which everybody has spoken with sympathy, which I am certain is shared by every member of your Lordships' House, a debate of this character should take place. I agree with the noble Marquess behind me that a postponement of three or four days would have had no effect one way or the other, and I also agree that it would have been hardly possible that this session—which, I think, may last somewhat longer than the noble Marquess opposite appears to think it likely—should close without some discussion upon India, conducted, as I hope, throughout in terms of moderation and without any suggestion that the Government of India is so enfeebled, whether by legislation or otherwise, that it is unable to take its proper place in maintaining law and order throughout the Indian Empire. But as the noble Marquess, Lord Salisbury, and those who agreed with him have not found it possible to accede to the appeal responsibly made to them by the Leader of the House, one can only hope that the debate will proceed peaceably and that, so far as possible, noble Lords who take part in it will abstain from provocation on one side or the other.

LORD AMPHILL had given notice to call attention to the present state of affairs

in India; and to move for Papers. The noble Lord said: My Lords, as I have a definite Motion on the Paper, perhaps it would be convenient if I said what I have to say now. I should like to point out in the first place that none of the considerations put forward by the noble Marquess, the Leader of the House, affects that which I intended to say. I desire to call attention to four definite points which I should in the ordinary course have made the subject of questions, but I thought it was more convenient, as an Indian debate was fixed for to-day, to raise the matters in that debate, and to make a Motion for Papers in order that the necessary information might be laid before Parliament. I may say at once that the four matters to which I am going to refer, and to which I intend to restrict myself, have no reference whatever to the tour of His Royal Highness in India. In regard to that particular matter I cannot see what difference it makes whether an Indian debate takes place to-day, or the day after to-morrow, or a week hence. His Royal Highness will be on the sea for nearly three weeks, and if the argument put forward by the noble Marquess, the Leader of the House, is to hold good, no reference should be made to India in either House of Parliament during that period. That amounts to this—that we could not discuss India during the present session of Parliament, or even until the Prince returns.

That will not do. In spite of what the noble Marquess the Leader of the House has said, Parliament is responsible for India. Great Britain is responsible for the good government and the welfare of the peoples of India, and that is the greatest and noblest responsibility that has ever been borne by one race for another. My reason for putting down a Motion was that I felt it a duty to call attention to the position of the public servants in all the public Services in India who, on our behalf, discharge that responsibility, and who, up to the present day, have by common consent discharged it in a magnificent manner—in a manner, in fact, which is written in letters of gold in the pages of history.

Before I proceed further I should tell your Lordships what are the four questions in regard to which I propose to move for Papers. The first is the question of proportionate pensions for members of the public Service. That is an old question which I raised at the end of last session, and in regard to which a further reply is

due to me. This question cannot possibly affect the present situation. The second question is in regard to the Moplah rebellion, a matter of urgent public importance which ought to be brought before Parliament and before the people of this country. The third thing is the Kernani case, and the fourth the Grant case, another matter affecting the position of our fellow-subjects in India which also demands the attention of Parliament.

I will begin with the first. In a letter from an official in India, which I have received, he states that the real unrest in India to-day is among the English officials who are uncertain as to their position and prospects. The publication of the conditions upon which they are to be allowed to retire has been delayed for a very considerable time. Your Lordships may remember that shortly before the adjournment for the recess—I think it was August 10—I called attention to this matter, and asked that an assurance that had been held out by the Joint Select Committee of the Government of India that proportionate pensions should be granted should be confirmed without delay. The noble Earl the Under-Secretary of State replied that the Government accepted the principle. Indeed, he stated so in the warmest terms. He said:

“My answer to that Question is an unqualified affirmative. His Majesty's Government do certainly accept the principles advocated both by the Government of India and the Joint Select Committee that members of the Public Service in India should, in certain circumstances, be permitted to retire on proportionate pension.”

He also said that the Secretary of State had agreed that these cases should be dealt with as a whole by Regulation instead of individually by the Secretary of State, because there was an unfortunate impression abroad that that was the intention of the Government. He told us that the India Office was settling the terms of such Regulations with the Government of India, and that the Secretary of State would take the first opportunity of making them public.

I believe I am right in stating that the Secretary of State, in another place, led us to believe that in about another week we should have that information. Nearly three months have passed, and no Regulations have been published. In view of what has been said, I do not want to use strong language, but it is very difficult to exaggerate the feeling of discontent

which now prevails in the public Service on account of this, and also on account of the appalling conditions under which officers have to serve in India. There is among them a feeling that the Secretary of State is furthering the desire of the Indian educated classes to squeeze or starve British officials out of India, and thereby to obtain more rapidly his professed aim of Indianising the Service. I adhere entirely to facts. Deputations from the Civil Service waited on the present Viceroy in September to urge an improvement of the conditions of service in India, and to ask for an early decision as to proportionate pensions, and they got no satisfactory reply on that point. An officer of high standing in the Indian Civil Service, writing by the last mail, says that no concession that costs money has a ghost of a chance of getting through the Assembly. Not only that, but any concessions now given will merely enure for the benefit of what will soon be a purely Indian Service, and as such be grossly overpaid.

Even if it is the aim of the present Administration to drive British officials out of India—and nine out of ten of them believe that that is the aim—is that a valid reason for denying them even the minimum of compensation involved in the grant of proportionate pensions? It is very difficult to understand why there should be such delay about so important a matter, in view of the deplorable consequences which delay is having. The noble Marquess the Leader of the House urged us to believe that the Viceroy and the Government of India, and all the authorities of India, know of these things much better than we do. Of course they do, but they know this, too—and that makes it all the more incomprehensible that there should be any delay about a matter which affects the contentment, confidence and loyalty of the public Service—that the prospects of British officials in India to-day are so gloomy that it is reported that in one Province 30 per cent. even of the junior civilians are only waiting for orders for proportionate pensions in order to resign the Service, and it is believed that the reason why these Regulations are withheld is that this exodus from the public Service is naturally dreaded.

All I have said so far refers primarily to the Indian Civil Service, which is regarded as doomed, but it applies equally to the other great Imperial Services—namely, the

Lord Amthill.

Indian Medical Service, the Public Works Department, and others. At the present moment fifty applications to resign by officers of the Indian Medical Service are pending at Simla, and more are coming in weekly. That does not look like a healthy state of affairs. In such circumstances how can honest and efficient administration, for which the British Parliament is responsible, be secured?—for in spite of the astonishing remarks made by the Leader of the House the British Parliament is responsible. How can honest and efficient administration be secured if the majority of the best men in the various Services are anxious to resign at the earliest moment they can? The noble Earl the Under-Secretary may reply that others will be able to take their places. But where are you to get them? The India Office is very well aware that British recruits of the stamp and the number required are not forthcoming.

My noble friend Lord Sydenham referred to the case of the late Indian Civil Service examination. It is well worth while giving your Lordships more of the facts. From particulars which have appeared in the Press I find that of the twenty-three candidates for the last competition for the Indian Civil Service, Home and Colonial, seventeen would seem, from their names, to be British and six of Indian origin. Of the seventeen British candidates not one selected the Indian Civil Service as his first choice, while eleven are prepared to go without an appointment rather than accept one in India. That is a nice state of things. The only successful candidates who elected for India were the six Indians.

Under the new scheme half the vacancies are in a few years to be filled in India, and one-fourth are already so filled. The competitive examination in this country was expected to supply the British element, but if the figures I have quoted are any guide the number of British candidates will be very small in a few years. India will shortly get half elected in India among the Indians, and the other half, which ought to be filled by Englishmen from this country, will also be monopolised by Indians and the Services of India will be Indianised. That is the position. The people who will fill the places which hitherto have been occupied by that magnificent race of public servants, the Indian Civil Service, will be natives of India, who are not bred

for it, and have neither the experience nor the prestige. The question to consider—and this is where the responsibility of Parliament comes in—is, how many British bayonets will be required to keep these men in place and power? We shall have to support them as long as we are responsible for India, and it is a very serious consideration for Parliament. The District Magistrate or Collector in India rules over hundreds of thousands of people by the sheer force of prestige, because he is an Englishman representing the great, just and beneficent British *Raj*. But take him away and put in his place a man who is loathed and despised by half his fellow-countrymen and you will have to support him with armed force.

Take the Medical Service. The Indian Medical Service has been boycotted for years by the great medical schools in this country. British candidates are not forthcoming for this Service or for the Police. How can the British standard of administration be maintained in these circumstances? That is the question we have to consider. We have ruled India because we have kept the administration up to a certain standard; take away the men who have maintained it at such a high standard, and it goes. That is where the responsibility of Parliament enters. Who is responsible? It must be the India Office which set out on a deliberate policy of wrecking the Services by eliminating the British element and lowering British prestige. Now they are going into the highways and the byways to induce men to come in. But they cannot do it.

You may maintain silence in Parliament, and you may silence the Press, as is now done in some extraordinary way, but you cannot stop men in India from writing home to their friends. That is what they are doing now. They are writing to their friends in public schools and universities and are saying, "Do not come to India whatever you do." I have heard it from more than one quarter and it is a most deplorable thing. That is the reason why the Secretary of State will not get men of the same stamp to fill the places of the men he is driving and squeezing out of the public Services in India. It is also the reason why I am moving for Papers to show what these Regulations are, and what the scale of pensions is to be. It is a matter of urgent public importance; in fact, nothing could be more desirable than that this

knowledge should be available for every public servant in India at the present time.

Let me say a few words on the second subject—the Moplah rebellion. I know something of the Moplahs, because it was my good fortune to be Governor of Madras for over five years. Nothing is more familiar than a Moplah rebellion. It is a thing we were always anticipating, and every one who knew the stories of the Moplah rebellions knew exactly how they were dealt with. The Moplah is in many ways a delightful creature. We had two battalions of Moplahs, which were, unfortunately, disbanded. They were great, jolly, cheery sportsmen, full of humour, magnificent in physique and, on the whole, thoroughly honest fellows. But the Moplah, owing to his breeding and race, happens to be at times a wild fanatic. There is no race of people in the world who are so easily affected by any call of fanaticism, and when the Moplah becomes a fanatic he becomes exactly like a mad dog, and the only way to treat him is to treat him in the same way as you would treat a mad dog. His only object at such a time is to die. He does not want to live. His firm belief, that if he gets killed in fighting against the infidel he goes straight to Paradise, makes him desirous of getting killed. They generally shut themselves up in some temple until every one is killed. You will see therefore that the ignorance and fanaticism of the Moplahs makes them ready material for seditious propaganda, and that is all the more reason for protecting them against it.

In pursuit of the Montagu-Chelmsford policy of—I will give their own words—

"Disturbing deliberately the placid pathetic contentment of the masses for their own highest good,"

all safeguards and precautions were abandoned. Gandhi and the Ali brothers were allowed to preach openly doctrines of Non-co-operation with a "Satanic Government," and the duty of Mahomedans to join in a Jihad, or holy war. That is really asking for trouble. You might as well drop a lighted match on a powder-barrel. Their agents had been active there for months. They organised the Caliphate Volunteers, who raised the Turkish flag when the rebellion broke out. But the Turkish flag and the Caliphate agitation had nothing to do with it. It meant nothing to the Moplahs. All it meant was that they had got their Government and were going to

kill the Hindus. "If we cannot get them forcibly to join Islam, we will kill them and take their wives." That is their idea of self-government and self-determination.

The second reason is this. The leading agitator, Yakub Hassen, a member of the Madras Council, who was imprisoned by the local authority for preaching sedition among the Moplahs, was released immediately the rebellion broke out. It seems incredible. Thirdly, the District Magistrate's warnings of the impending rebellion were disregarded and his application to extend the Sedition Meetings Act was refused. He was refused permission to do the one thing that could have stopped the trouble. Then, fourthly—and this is even more extraordinary—the British garrison at Malapuram, which is the great Moplah centre, was removed this spring in deference to the demand by the new Legislative Assembly for reduction in the Army, and especially the British garrison. It was simply an axiom of the Government of Madras, with which I am familiar, that it would be dangerous ever to remove a garrison from Malapuram. That was pointed out again and again, not as affecting the present situation, but the stationing of the Army, and it was always regarded as an axiom. In spite of that, although they knew the rebellion was coming, they removed the garrison. This was stated by the Commander-in-Chief, Lord Rawlinson, in the Assembly in September. Fifthly, the Moplahs were encouraged to believe that rebellion was a safe game by announcing and circulating among them—I am quoting the words from the Madras Government Publicity Bureau—

"The apology tendered by the Supreme Government for the Punjab incidents in the Imperial Legislative Assembly."

This is from a new institution which apparently exists in Madras, and it was published broadcast by the agitators with comments of their own.

Finally, we have the authoritative statement of the present Governor of Madras to the Madras Legislative Council in September last, that the Moplah rebellion was an inevitable outcome of the propaganda associated with Mr. Gandhi. But Mr. Gandhi is still at large. The author of the thing is still allowed to go about. The Hunter Committee, the Government of India and the Home Government were unanimous in holding that Gandhi's passive resistance caused the disorders and the

Lord Ampthill.

Punjab rebellion of 1919. I ask your Lordships how many more rebellions will this man be allowed to bring about, and how many more thousands of lives is he to be responsible for, before he is arrested? How much longer is he going to be allowed to defy the law, and to boast of doing so? It is difficult to understand why he is not arrested now. It was quite easy to understand it in the late *régime*, because Mr. Gandhi was, as a matter of fact, pursuing the same policy and the same methods as the then Viceroy, Lord Chelmsford, and the Secretary of State. Their policy was deliberately to disturb the placid, pathetic contentment of the peoples of India for their highest good. That is what Mr. Gandhi is doing, and so it would have been inconsistent to have arrested him then. But the present Viceroy is not bound by any such policy; he has not declared himself to be in favour of that policy; and so it is difficult to understand why he does not do the obvious, and arrest this dangerous and crazy fanatic.

Why has the Moplah rebellion been going on for three months, with the loss of thousands of lives and appalling cruelties? The reason is simply that there was lack of vigour and initiative in handling it at the start. Your Lordships will remember hearing in this House the extraordinary statement by the late Under-Secretary, Lord Sinha, who said—

"Do not interfere too hastily or too violently with an agitation of this kind. Let it kill itself, as in time it does."

Since that pronouncement was made thousands of lives have been lost as the result of Gandhi's further agitation. That this was no chance phrase, adopted hastily by Lord Sinha himself when he was answering for the India Office, that it was part of a settled policy, is clear from the fact that the late Viceroy also used it, and suggested that the Gandhi movement should be left to die of its own inanity. How is it to be wondered at, when such a policy holds good, that anarchy and rebellion should run riot?

Contrast this with the Punjab rebellion of 1919. That was crushed in two weeks, with the loss of 450 lives all told. This rebellion has been going on for three months, and has caused the loss of at least two thousand lives, apart entirely from the untold numbers of Hindus who have been murdered in every circumstance of barbarity. The officers, civil and military,

who crushed the Punjab rebellion in a fortnight were visited with censure and displeasure by the same Government that at the outset had called upon them to use drastic measures and had assured them of its full countenance and support. The consequence of censuring those who had done exactly what the Government had told them to do has only been to paralyse officers, civil and military, who were confronted with the same duty in similar circumstances.

My noble friend has referred to the case of two young officers of the Leinsters who were out with small detachments, and it is quite worth while to tell your Lordships a bit more about it. They were confronted with a large rebel gathering early in the outbreak, and, thinking that they were acting in accordance with the wishes of the authorities, instead of opening fire, they endeavoured to parley with the rebels. What was the result? They were immediately hemmed in, murdered, and mutilated in the most horrible manner. Are there not others besides the Moplahs who were responsible for their murder? And does not this justify, more than anything could possibly justify, the vote which your Lordships gave in this House in the matter of General Dyer?

In such conditions as those which I have named, rebellion spreads like a forest fire, and early in October, seven weeks after the outbreak, we find—and this is really a most noteworthy point—that a thousand residents of Malabar, of all classes, are petitioning the Viceroy to take more drastic measures to save them from misery and death. We find unfortunate Hindus asking why aeroplanes and machine guns, which were used with such effect in the Punjab to disperse the rebels, were not used to protect the loyal population in Malabar. It has all been in the papers, or rather in the only two papers which publish any information about India. No such appeal has ever been made to the Viceroy before; it is unique in the whole history of our administration, and the fact that it was made shows your Lordships what are going to be the consequences of self-government in India. Those consequences will be either that the Hindu will cut the throat of the Mahomedan or that the Mahomedan will cut the throat of the Hindu, where he is in a predominant position. That has happened at once, at the very suggestion that British rule had ceased, in Malabar.

I should like to tell your Lordships something about the refinements of torture which are being used by these Moplah fanatics. There is one leader there, as I see by the papers, who delights in flaying his victims alive. Another thing is that they have compelled high-caste Hindus to dig their own graves, and, after murdering them if they refused to embrace Islam, they buried them in graves of their own digging. There can be no higher refinement of torture than that for the native of India, for in so doing the Moplahs are dishonouring the Hindus in this life and destroying their chance of salvation in the next. Your Lordships, I am sure, know enough about India to be aware that it is fatal to the Hindu to be buried just as it is fatal and destructive of eternal salvation for the Mahomedan to be burned. They care more about that than anything else, and if you make a Hindu dig his own grave and then, if he staunchly refuses to change his religion and embrace Islam, you bury him, he knows that he has no chance whatever of eternal life. These things are taking place daily in a tract which has been for a hundred years under British rule.

I want to ask for Papers showing what passed between the Government of Madras and the Collector of Malabar and the Madras Government and the Government of India, in order that we may know why it was not possible to crush this rebellion at the outset. The paralysis of authority—my noble friend did not use any terms too strong in regard to what is going on—has spread to all departments of Government, and I want to call attention to the case of Mr. Harry Grant, a zamindar or landowner in the province of Behar and Orissa, and his estate manager called Antonini. Mr. Grant's estate includes certain lands which are periodically submerged by the Ganges. When they appear above water they become highly fertile, and he lets them to tenants, but when they are submerged no rents are charged, and, naturally, no crops are derived from them. These lands, which are a feature of the Ganges, are an object of covetous desire on the part of the turbulent villagers in that region. Mr. Grant, who had let them to certain tenants, found that those tenants were going to be disturbed by the villagers, who wished to take possession of the lands. He therefore appealed for protection on six occasions in December, 1919, November, 1920, December, 1920, and in January of this year, and in every case protection was

refused. As the position became intolerable, Mr. Grant had to protect himself, and so he engaged some men to supplement his ordinary peons and watchmen whom everybody has to employ in India, to watch and guard his land and property and to protect his tenants. He got forty Ghurkas, ex-sepoys, from Lucknow, to protect himself and his land and tenants. When they arrived on the spot they were ambushed by a large mob, carrying lighted torches, axes and *lathis*. Twenty of the Ghurkas were killed outright, and the rest were wounded and scattered.

As a result of this serious affray the local police decided to bestir themselves, and arrested Mr. Grant and his manager on a charge of inciting to an unlawful assembly. They were placed before the sub-divisional Magistrate, where both claimed to be tried as European British subjects. The case against Mr. Grant was transferred to the Court of the District Magistrate, but the sub-divisional Magistrate refused to treat Antonini, the manager, as a European, and the latter was therefore forced to appeal to the High Court, which quashed the sub-divisional Magistrate's ruling and ordered Antonini to be treated as a European British subject. Believing that he would not get justice from the District Magistrate, Mr. Grant applied to the High Court to have the proceedings quashed. The High Court ordered the hearing of the case to be transferred to the Court of the District Magistrate, Monghyr, an adjacent district. The District Magistrate, Monghyr, heard the case and delivered a judgment absolutely exonerating Mr. Grant from the charge made against him by the Bhagalpur Police. He pointed out that there was indisputable evidence that Mr. Grant did not wish or intend to create a breach of the peace; that he was forced to employ the Ghurka watchmen as the only alternative to being forcibly dispossessed of his property; and that he would not have been obliged to do this if the local magisterial and police authorities had done their duty and given him the protection for which he had asked so many times, and to which he was entitled.

Mr. Grant has no redress. His crops have been forcibly seized, his watchmen have been murdered, he has been unjustifiably forced to spend a large sum of money in defending himself in the Courts from charges which ought never to have been brought against him; and he has no

Lord Ampthill.

guarantee that the mob will not be permitted to behave in exactly the same way when the next crops are ready for harvesting. What I want to know is what is going to be done to give Mr. Grant some compensation, and to prevent a recurrence of a business of this kind, which not only affects Mr. Grant but discourages public confidence in law and authority all over India. That is the Grant case.

Then I wish to say a word or two on the well-known Munitions Board case. Failure to enforce the law against the Ali brothers, until they had brought on the Moplah outbreak, and Gandhi, because they were influential people, is paralleled by the decision of a member of the Government of India, with which two of his colleagues in the Council agreed, to drop the prosecution of Sukhlal Kernani and Bannerjee, two wealthy Indians of Calcutta, although, in the opinion of the Advocate-General, there was an overwhelming case against them of swindling the Government out of large sums of money. Lord Reading, bowing to public outcry against this scandalous decision, repudiated his colleague's action, and Sir Thomas Holland resigned. I want to know why the two colleagues consulted by Sir Thomas Holland, and who approved of his action, did not also resign their appointments, when they were partly responsible for his action. I want to ask, when I move for Papers, for the Minutes of the Executive Council of the Governor-General, showing how the decision not to order a prosecution was arrived at, and also for Papers giving Sir Thomas Holland's reasons for his action.

The present Administration, both at the India Office and in India, has entirely lost the confidence of the public, alienated its loyal supporters, disgusted its faithful servants, many of whom are eager to quit its Service, and brought about discontent, disorder and rebellion throughout the length and breadth of India. What I would like to ask your Lordships is whether this is the result of the much vaunted reforms, and whether we have any hope that the results of those reforms will be any better in the future. When the Reform Bill was introduced in this House, the noble Marquess the Leader of the House assured us, in terms of impressive solemnity, which certainly gave us the idea that he was making pledges on behalf of the Government, that an essential condition of these reforms was that there should be no lower-

ing of the standards of the Civil Service, whose work had enabled India to take its present place in the Empire. Has that condition been fulfilled, in view of the circumstances to which I have called attention ?

The second condition which he laid down was that nothing should be done to impair or diminish the authority of the Central Government in India. Has that been fulfilled ? The third was that nothing should be done to weaken the protection given by the British *Raj* to the masses to whom the franchise and the vote meant nothing. Yet here you have a large population obliged to appeal to the Viceroy for protection against murder and outrage of all kinds. The fourth condition was that nothing should be done to encourage the belief that India can safely cut herself adrift from the Empire. That belief is universal now in India. If you look at the newspapers you see every day some resolution passed by a public body, showing that the people believe that British rule is coming to an end very shortly. I believe that the Lahore Municipal Council have decided to pull down the statue of John Lawrence. Therefore, that condition has not been fulfilled.

I ask your Lordships to look at the India of to-day and to contrast it with the India of 1917, or any other time prior to the advent of the present Secretary of State. What is the responsibility of your Lordships' House ? It was suggested to us at the outset of these proceedings that we have no business to interfere ; that it was the business of the Viceroy and of the authorities in India ; but it is laid down in the preamble of the Reform Act that the time and manner of each advance can be determined only by Parliament, upon whom responsibility lies for the welfare and advancement of the Indian peoples. Do your Lordships think that that responsibility is being properly discharged by the present Administration, either here or in India ?

Before I sit down I will venture upon a prophecy. That prophecy is this. I believe that the Ali brothers were interned merely in order to provide material for clemency, and that, just as the leaders of the Punjab rebellion were amnestied after a few months, so these two will shortly be released and similar action will be taken. It is easy to conjecture that, because we see what is going on elsewhere—

in Ireland, for instance. I thank your Lordships for having listened to me so patiently. I am sure you will agree that the four matters to which I have referred are matters of definite and urgent public importance, in regard to which I am justified in asking the Government to furnish Parliament and the public with further information. Therefore, when the proper moment arrives, I shall, with your Lordships' permission, move for Papers.

THE EARL OF MIDLETON : My Lords, I do not propose to follow the noble Lord into the important questions which he has raised, but I must confess I think this House is not open to the reproach which the Leader of the House addressed to us, or the suggestion that it is at all likely that an unwise or inopportune discussion would be countenanced in this House. I do not know any body of men on whom for the last seven years the Government have drawn so generously for reticence and reserve. And I will go further and say that on many occasions, some of which I could mention, the effect of that reticence on our part has been that action has been taken against which it was well known we should have protested, and with regard to which we have found ourselves afterwards quite unable to make any impression upon the Government or upon events. It is for that reason that I suggest to the noble Marquess that there is a reciprocal liability upon him and upon the Government for the demand which they have made upon your Lordships to-night.

Events are moving very fast in India. I should like your Lordships to consider the position in which we are placed. We had very little opportunity of discussion on any subject at the close of the summer part of the session. We were bombarded with measures to such an extent that it would have been almost impossible to find even a small part of any one evening on which we could have brought up questions. We have every hope that these sittings will be of brief duration, and therefore it will be February before any questions can be brought forward. That means that for seven or eight months your Lordships and Parliament will be debarred from any exercise of their undoubted duty of reviewing what is now going on in India.

That being so, I would venture to ask the noble Marquess to give us a direct

pledge that on certain points not only will no action be taken by the Government but that there will not be that degree of acceptance of policy which would not merely make its reversal impossible but would make its incidence entirely independent of any criticism which we may pass upon it in this House. There is one question, which I am merely going to indicate to the noble Marquess, to which this applies. We have heard, and it has been reported in the public Press, that great changes are to take place in the Indian Army and considerable reductions of British troops. I shall not even mention any of the points which fell from Lord Sydenham or those which, by innuendo, also fell from Lord Ampthill. But I do say this—that there is more authority in this House to discuss the desirability of maintaining at its full strength the force of British troops in the Indian Army than in any assembly in the world. And I ask the noble Marquess to give us a definite assurance that, if those measures are, as we believe, under discussion, no step will be taken until we have had the opportunity of thoroughly reviewing them in this House. I think we have a right to ask for that assurance. I cannot imagine a more dangerous thing in the present state of India, internally and externally, than any attempt to square the Budget by a rapid or undue reduction in the military forces.

I should like to ask that the points which have been raised with regard to the Civil Service should receive special attention from the Government. There is great uneasiness in this country as to the condition of the Civil Service; and, speaking as a member of the Committee of which my noble friend, Lord Selborne, was Chairman, there was an absolute Parliamentary bargain, if you may call it so, with regard to the Civil Service. In both these matters I would point out that the responsibility cannot rest with the Government alone. Parliament, as has been well pointed out by Lord Ampthill, has a direct and absolute responsibility for the future of India. And the fact that subjects of the greatest importance are tumbling over each other for settlement, that members of this House who are in the Government, like the noble Viscount who would normally be sitting on the Woolsack, are so engaged, with Cabinet Committees and settlements, both at home and abroad, that they are unable to give the ordinary time to them which

The Earl of Middleton.

the importance of those subjects would have commanded at any other period of our history, makes it the more necessary that we should insist, so far as we can, that the authority of Parliament is not set at naught, especially with regard to these great questions in India.

Therefore it is that I appeal to the noble Marquess, who has obtained by his appeal to-night an immunity from criticism and discussion which at any other time it would have been difficult to justify, an assurance that decisions which might be seriously altered by discussions here will not be taken during the close time which he is asking that we should apply to the Government.

VISCOUNT CHELMSFORD: My Lords, you will hardly be surprised that I should wish to address you to-night on this very important question. It is only some six months ago that I gave up the responsibility of the government of India. I do not disclaim any responsibility for the acts which I did during my tenure of office, and I welcome this opportunity of putting before your Lordships some of the considerations which weighed with me in the conduct of affairs during my term of office.

Personal questions have never weighed very strongly with me, and I have never put forward the personal view of things when I felt that the public interests outweighed those personal considerations. And I should not have alluded to any personal matter if it had not been that both Lord Sydenham and Lord Ampthill, in the course of their remarks, asserted quite plainly to your Lordships that I had not supported the officers in the Punjab rising. Now, I have endeavoured ever since that rising to abstain, though at the risk of misunderstanding of my own attitude, from utterance on the question, because I do not wish to say one word which would increase the tension which had arisen over those unfortunate occurrences. But let me state in a few sentences what my position was; what I did and what I did not do.

The Punjab rising was a very serious one, especially serious because of the virile and martial character of the men of the Province of the Punjab. Action had to be taken, and had to be taken summarily and promptly. I assured Sir Michael O'Dwyer, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, and I assured, through a

resolution of the Government of India, his officers, that they would have unwavering support in any action they thought it advisable to take. The rising was put down. When we came to discuss the question of the rising, if your Lordships have read the Despatch which the Government of India wrote on this subject, you will have seen that we showed that so far as the rising was concerned, we, the Government of India, had given unwavering support to the local Government in the action they found it necessary to take. We praised Sir Michael O'Dwyer for his conduct during that time. We praised the officers of the Punjab generally for the action they took during that time, and we praised the military officers who took action under their leaders.

We found it necessary, in certain cases, to express our disapproval of methods which had been adopted which we said were both injudicious and improper. It is, surely, an impossible doctrine of agency that when you inform your agents that you are going to give them unwavering support, it carries that support to actions which cannot be justified according to the ordinary method of action. It seemed to us that it was impossible for us to pass over certain methods which had been adopted, and we said in our Despatch that those methods had been both injudicious and improper. So far, and so far alone, can it be said for one moment that full support was not given to our officers in the Punjab with regard to those occurrences. I have not put General Dyer's case, because that was a case which stood on its own footing, and our position is made quite clear in our Despatch with regard to that case. But I am now referring to those cases of subordinate officers who acted under the Punjab Government, and so under the Government of India, in connection with that rising. I ask your Lordships who have any doubt in the matter to read that Despatch and see whether there is any indication in it of our having let our officers down by one jot or one tittle. I should not have alluded to that matter had it not been put forward twice in the speeches of the noble Lords, Lord Amthill and Lord Sydenham, that I had not, or the Governor-General in Council had not, given that support to our officers during that rising which our officers had a right to expect from us.

Now let me pass on to the subject of our discussion this evening, which I desire to

treat in the broadest possible way. The dominating factor in the present Indian situation is the race and colour issue. Race feeling is not a growth of yesterday or to-day. I remember that when the noble Lord, Lord Meston, who is sitting on the benches opposite, was giving up the Lieutenant-Governorship of the United Provinces, I think at the end of 1916 or the beginning of 1917, he told me he was sorry to say that he had never found the racial feeling so strong as it was at that time. But it had not commenced then; it is the growth of years. What I would impress upon your Lordships is that strictly speaking it is not an Indian issue at all. It is a world-wide issue. There is a revolt of the coloured races going on all over the world against the ascendancy of the white races, and if your Lordships are interested in the matter and would ask for justification, which, of course, I could not give in the course of a short debate like this, I would recommend you to read a book written by an American, a Mr. Stoddart, which came out some six months or a year ago, and is called "The Rising Tide of Colour." I do not for a moment suggest that I endorse all the conclusions in that book, but it is a collection of facts with regard to this very great question which it is well worth the while of any of your Lordships to read.

But though it is not merely an Indian problem, it meets you in almost every Indian question which comes up. Take the relations of India to the Empire. One of the most serious questions that confront His Majesty's Government at the present moment is the position of Indians overseas. We had it in connection with indentured labour in Fiji. We have had it lately in connection with East Africa, apart from the question of the position of Indians in the Dominions. Take the question of railway policy. One would imagine that this race issue would hardly come into the question of railway policy; yet, I think, those of your Lordships who are familiar with the controversy of State *versus* company management in the railways of India at the present moment will find that this race and colour issue plays a very prominent part in it. Take the question of contracts and appointments under Government. We are continually being accused of undue preference to the British. Take even that most difficult problem of exchange on which a Commission appointed by the Secretary of State sat not so very long ago. The

Report of that Commission was attacked on the ground that it was devised to favour the British financier. And so I might go on. I am not discussing the validity of these arguments; that would be beside the point at the present moment. I am merely indicating what I would impress upon your Lordships is the all-pervading character of this issue in connection with the situation in India.

Two consequences have flowed from this. In the past I think we may not unfairly say that we governed India on the basis of the acknowledged superiority of the British race. That superiority is now challenged, and in surveying the situation you cannot ignore the fact that the challenge has been made. Secondly, it is often said, and said truly, that there is no Indian nation; that there are hundreds of races and innumerable creeds. But this colour issue has become the unifying force in India, and through all the diversities of creeds and races it is creating a unity. That, again, is a fact which you cannot ignore in surveying the position of things in India at the present moment.

Passing from that dominating factor which many of your Lordships must have in mind when you consider the situation in India, I come now to the second large issue. That is the issue of the constitutional reforms which have been identified with the names of the Secretary of State and myself. I think it may be said not unfairly that a man's view with regard to the situation in India will be largely coloured by the fact whether he is for or against that scheme of constitutional reform which was introduced at the beginning of this year. Those against that policy—we have heard it said to-night by noble Lords—would say: "All the trouble is due to your policy." I would say that but for that policy the whole of India would be against you, and you would not have a friend at all.

Let me put one or two considerations with regard to this issue. Lord Sydenham was quite right when he said this policy is no new one. It is the logical and inevitable sequel of the past—not the reforms of 1892 associated with the names of Lord Dufferin and Lord Lansdowne, nor the reforms associated with the names of Lord Morley and Lord Minto, but going back to Macaulay's Minute of 1835. In 1835 Lord Macaulay, as many of your Lordships are aware, got the consent of the Governor-

General in Council at that time to make English the medium of instruction in the education of Indians. I am not concerned for a moment this evening to argue whether that policy was right or wrong. I have often talked over the question with educated Indians, and many of them have said to me quite frankly: "We think it was a wrong policy." Also, at that very time it was a matter of fierce debate in the Governor-General's Council, and certain of the members of the Council, who have been styled in history as Orientalists, resigned their position when Lord William Bentinck accepted Lord Macaulay's Minute.

But it is an act of State which has carried tremendous consequences in the history of India. In the first place, it has created that class of Indians, to whom I have already alluded, who are imbued with our views, our ideals, and our inspirations, and who have challenged us with regard to our acknowledged superiority. In the second place it has moulded the minds of educated Indians in a way that led to the inevitable demand for political development that should imitate the model held out to India. Can it be said, in the face of the history following on Lord Macaulay's Minute, that the reforms which we instituted last year are anything but the inevitable and logical sequel to Macaulay's Minute? It is sometimes said—and Lord Sydenham has said to-night—"You have based your policy on the conciliation of the politically-minded classes, an insignificant fraction of the population, and not the true leaders of the people." That is a very plausible argument. I would ask your Lordships to consider where it would lead you.

Is there any country in the world where, in matters of government, you can ignore the politically-minded class, and where that politically-minded class is not a small fraction of the population? Of course it is the politically-minded class that demands reform, that presses on reform, and that is going to influence the rest of the population. And even in India you cannot under-estimate the influence of this class. Take, my Lords, a village scene. You motor through a village, and you find a collection of people around the village well, being addressed, or read to, by some man. They are illiterate probably, and could not read or think for themselves upon these questions. But there is a member of the

educated class sitting in the middle of the village reading a vernacular paper, or explaining some theory of political development which they do not understand, but which, at all events, is influencing them. It is impossible to say that you can pass by the influence of the politically-minded classes in India.

In this matter I have had always before my eyes the Irish parallel. I recognise that every historic parallel can be pressed too far, but I would ask your Lordships to consider that parallel for what it is worth. In the year 1801 Mr. Pitt, as we know, passed the Act of Union, but that Act was part of a much larger policy, aimed at the conciliation and winning the co-operation of the Roman Catholic Church. The latter portion of his policy was, as we know, dropped, largely owing to the opposition of the Sovereign of the time. Might not the course of Irish history have been vastly different if that policy had been carried out in its entirety, and the co-operation of the Roman Catholic Church gained at that time? What we are aiming at in India is winning the co-operation of the politically-minded classes. Let me draw the parallel—like the Roman Catholic priesthood, a fraction of the population; like the Roman Catholic priesthood, the educated portion of the population; like the Roman Catholic priesthood, with little or no experience of government; but, like the Roman Catholic priesthood, if co-operation is not secured, with infinite capacity for making government difficult.

I have felt it necessary to review my policy in some detail, because I wish to make your Lordships understand the general considerations which have governed the policy with which my name is identified, especially when we come to deal with the great problem of Non-cooperation. I think your Lordships will have gathered from what I have said the paramount importance that I attached to constitutional reform. I have shown you the depth of racial feeling that you might realise that it would be only through the Councils that Englishmen and Indians could come together and understand each other. There is no such help to understanding as partnership in work, and so it is through the Council that one may hope that the understanding will come which will ameliorate the racial feeling that at present exists. I put before your Lordships Lord Macaulay's Minute to show you the

inevitableness of asking for reform. I cited the Irish parallel to emphasise the disastrous results of not securing co-operation. In my policy I felt it imperative that the new Constitution should function; that we must win to our side the co-operation of the Constitutional Party, and that in any action we might think right to take we should have secured the support of the Constitutional Party. It was obvious then, if that policy was to be pursued, that a policy of repression, preceding or coinciding with the initiation of reforms, would, in the first place, have jeopardised the whole of the policy, and, in the second place, have made the Constitutional Party suspicious of the honesty of our intentions. I knew that we might have an uncomfortable time, but I felt that the gain would be great.

Lord Ampthill has given you a quotation from a speech from which I do not recede for one moment. I knew that we might have an uncomfortable time, but I felt that the gain would be great if the policy of Non-cooperation were rejected by the Indians themselves, endowed for the first time with responsibility. In other words, I took a long, and not a short, view of the situation.

It has been mentioned once or twice this evening that the Secretary of State for India is a sinister figure in connection with the policy in India. May I say this, and say it most emphatically, that as regards the question of our policy with reference to Non-cooperation the Secretary of State from beginning to end has had no part or lot in it, except to be kept fully informed by myself and my Government of all that we were doing and the policy we were pursuing. I think it is only fair, when a great public servant is being continually attacked for a policy which is not his, though he may have accepted it but did not initiate, that I who am responsible for it should most distinctly say where the responsibility lies. It lies on my shoulders.

How far has this policy of ours been successful? Three stages were laid down for working out the policy of Non-cooperation, and stages two and three were not to come into operation until the failure of the first stage. As a matter of fact stages two and three did not come into operation while I was in India. There were various items in stage one. I will give them briefly, and ask you to consider how far the Non-cooperation movement

has been successful with any of them. There was surrender of titles. In February last there were five thousand holders of titles in India and only twenty-four surrendered their titles. The next item was refusal to attend Government functions. I have never heard of garden parties of the Viceroy or Governors refused on the ground of Non-cooperation. These are small matters, but I am taking the items laid down in Mr. Gandhi's proposal.

Next, withdrawal from Government schools. This was very interesting, because it was a direct struggle between Mr. Gandhi on the one side and the educated classes on the other. When Mr. Gandhi went down to a school the students invariably came out and remained out as long as he was in the vicinity. But as soon as he went away the students went back. They were not going to be deprived of the education they could get from the schools and colleges, and so it used to be in some cases a regular see-saw. But the policy of Mr. Gandhi with regard to education has failed and it has been defeated by the action of Indians themselves. I come to the boycott by lawyers and the setting up of separate Courts. When I was in India I said that I happened to be a barrister myself and that from my experience I did not see lawyers giving up their practice in order to follow Mr. Gandhi. That was perfectly true. They have not. It is probable that one could count on the fingers of one hand the number of those barristers who have given up their practice ; and, of course, separate Courts have never been accepted in any way.

Another item which looked serious, but was not so serious at it looked, was refusal on the part of the military to serve in Mesopotamia because of the broken pledges in connection with the Caliphate. As a matter of fact, shortly after that practically all our soldiers were withdrawn from Mesopotamia and we never had any difficulty in getting soldiers to go there. Then, lastly, there is refusal to stand for the Councils or vote for the Councils. That was put forward by Mr. Gandhi as a deliberate challenge to the new Constitution. It is true that a large number of voters did not vote, but it is equally true that a great number did vote ; a surprising number considering the novelty of the great experiment. If your Lordships will look at the figures given in the Report of Mr. R. Williams you will see that a sur-

prising number of people did vote on the first occasion. We had, and have, absolutely full Councils. Stages two and three are relinquishing civil appointments and withdrawals from police and Army. As regards those I cannot speak, because they were not brought into operation while I was in India, but I have no doubt the Under-Secretary of State will be able to give your Lordships full information with regard to them.

To sum up, the educated classes have refused to join in the movement, and not only that, each day you see fresh desertions on the part of the educated classes from the movement. There was a remarkable speech or letter reported the other day by Mr. Wadia, who has been one of the thorns in the side of the Madras Government of recent years, because he has been the leader of the industrial strikes in Madras. If the report in *The Times* is accepted as accurate, he has in the most emphatic terms severed himself from Mr. Gandhi and denounced the impracticability of his movement.

Now we come—and this of course is the grave issue—to the masses. What of them ? I think your Lordships must remember that we are not living in ordinary times, but in times when we feel the aftermath of the great war. Economic causes and not political causes in the main are the reason for the inflammability of the masses in India at the present moment. The high prices for cloth and food make it very easy to inflame them at the moment ; and there are also a certain number of problems quite unconnected with Non-cooperation which have to be considered as well. The noble Lord, Lord Mac Donnell, who is now in the House, will remember that in the United Provinces the question of the tenants' rights in Oude was always a burning question and that the Government of the United Provinces found it difficult to move in the direction of giving the tenants in the Province of Oude the same occupancy rights as were possessed by tenants in the Province of Agra. It has existed ever since the noble Lord's time and the present Government has endeavoured to remedy the grievance. When you hear that there are disturbances in Oude they circle round this question of the grievance of the tenants against their landlords. The Non-cooperation movement leaders are skilled and will rub salt into any sore they may find in the body politic, and so they managed to raise disturbances there. But consider the

Viscount Chelmsford.

difficulty of prosecuting in a case like that, where you find people coming forward and impressing upon tenants grievances which really exist in their daily life, and saying, "You ought not to stand this."

That form of agitation has been known in the past history of Ireland and elsewhere, and is one of the most difficult forms of agitation for any Government to meet. While it is a serious question, this question of the masses, you have got to remember the economic causes which are at the root of it, and that they have grievances, and to hope that things may become better. I believe they will become better, because the Government, as I hope I have been able to convince your Lordships to some extent, have now got the Councils behind them in any action which they may find it necessary to take with regard to agitation, and, what has been more important, and a thing which could not be ordered or controlled by any Government, this year's monsoon in India has been one of the best on record. It will be much less easy to move the masses when they are busy ploughing their fields and reaping their harvest, than when they are considering how they are going to get a living during the coming year. The contentment of the masses depends upon the price of the *chupati*.

One word about the Moplah rising. I cannot say much about it, because I have been away from India. No one can talk lightly of a rising, especially a rising in which so much blood has been shed and so much property has been destroyed, but I think there are considerations which ought to induce us to look at the hopeful side of this question. In the first place, the country in which it has happened is an isolated part of India, so far as any part can be isolated. In the second place, the Moplahs are an ignorant and fanatical people, and they will get little or no sympathy from the rest of India in what they are doing. In the third place, the Government has public opinion behind it in dealing with this rising, and I believe that the Moplah rising is one of the greatest blows which has been given to Mr. Gandhi and his movement, because it has undoubtedly alienated from him an enormous amount of public support.

I must not trespass upon your Lordships' time any further. When a Viceroy leaves, a curtain falls behind him on the country which he has governed, and he

rarely knows with regard to the situation in India any more than is known by the man in the street. But I should like to enter this *caveat*: beware of rumours which reach you from India. From my last six months, I could tell your Lordships of four absolutely false reports which were circulated in England and appeared in the Press, any one of which might cause very grave apprehension in England. I have been speaking so long that I ought not to give you the details. But Lord Selborne evidently wishes to hear them, so I will give them very briefly.

The first report is this: I received a telegram—perhaps the Under-Secretary will remember—from Mr. Montagu, saying, "You have never told me that soviets have been established in the United Provinces." When I received this telegram I rubbed my eyes. I said that I did not know it either, but that I would make inquiries. I made inquiries, and I found that this is what had happened. A certain enterprising journalist had gone round to the office of a newspaper, whose editor he knew, and said to him, "By the way, can you tell me what a *Kisan Sabha* is?" I may tell your Lordships it is a tenants' association. The editor threw over his shoulder—either pulling the man's leg or feeling rather bored—"It is a sort of soviet." Off goes the journalist and sends a telegram to England saying that soviets are being established in the United Provinces. I can assure you, because I had it at first hand, that this is exactly what happened in connection with that rumour.

As to the second rumour, I heard indirectly that a telegram had gone home to the effect that, on my way to visit Calcutta, my special train had been stopped and that I had to return to Delhi. Having heard this, I at once telegraphed to the Secretary of State saying that I understood this telegram had gone to England in connection with myself, and that I could only say that I was not due to start for Calcutta until four days hence. But the telegram got into the papers. A third rumour was that the Sikh regiments had mutinied. It was absolutely without foundation; there was not a word of truth in it at all. The fourth rumour was that the Commander-in-Chief, in a speech which he made in the Council of State had gravely dissented from my policy and from the policy of the Government. Directly I received this from the Secretary of State

I sent for the Commander-in-Chief and asked him about it, and it turned out that the whole thing was a mutilated translation of the *Reuter* message which had gone home. In these ways scares are made, and I would earnestly ask your Lordships to beware how you receive rumours from India.

Now you have as Viceroy and Governor-General a statesman who is known to many of your Lordships; a man of great distinction; a man proved in many fields; a man of wisdom and experience, specially chosen to steer the ship of State on the new course in which it has been launched. You have at his side a Commander-in-Chief, a soldier of great intellectual ability and of proved nerve and resource in the great war. I would say, trust them and forbear to make their task more difficult by gloomy apprehensions or doubting fears, and you may be sure they will see to it that nothing amiss happens to the great charge which is in their hands.

THE EARL OF SELBORNE: My Lords, I should like to make two observations in respect of the very interesting speech to which we have just listened. The first is, how great is the gain to the House in the return of my noble friend, and the second, that I think his speech alone has been a complete justification of this debate, and in itself an answer to the objection taken by the Government. My reason for rising before my noble friend, the Under-Secretary, is to put to him one specific point, and one point alone. Great controversies have raged around the whole policy with which my noble friend, Lord Chelmsford, is identified, and which is now embodied in the Indian Constitution and the Government of India Act. We had the echoes of those controversies through many months in the Committee room of this House, when I presided over the Joint Select Committee of the two Houses of Parliament which dealt with the Bill which became an Act. But there was one aspect of the controversy upon which I thought there was complete agreement, unanimous assent, and that was that there should be no question of a change in the Constitution now adopted for ten years.

I understood that the Government of India agreed, that His Majesty's Government agreed, and that Parliament agreed. Most certainly the Joint Select Committee had the strongest possible opinion, which

Viscount Chelmsford

they manifested with all the power at their command, that a ten years' trial should be given to this Constitution; that at the end of that period a Parliamentary Commission should be sent out; and that any future change or development, in one direction or another, should depend upon the Report of that Commission. I thought that that was a universally agreed policy, and it seems to me, to-day, as it seemed then, to be eminently wise.

My reason for bringing this forward is because I read with great dismay—I use no less an expression than that—in the *Morning Post* of October 3 a report of a debate in the Legislative Assembly at Simla. The telegram is dated September 29, and it says:

“The Legislative Assembly devoted the whole of to-day to a discussion of the resolution moved by Mr. Mozoomdar (non-official, Bengal) in favour of the establishment of complete provincial autonomy, an early extension of responsibility in the Central Government, and the conferment of full Dominion self-government on India from the beginning of the fourth term of the Legislative Assembly in 1929.”

Now, I do not think there is anything remarkable in the fact that one Indian gentleman, a member of the Assembly, should think it right to bring forward such a proposition. That is not the subject of my dismay; nor is the fact that, according to this report, the proposal received much support from Indian non-official members, “whose main argument was that the success already achieved by the reformed Councils justified an immediate further advance.” I cannot say that I think that that attitude was wise. This “tremendous experiment,” as Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford always admitted it to be, and as every thinking man, whether European or Indian, who came before our Committee agreed that it was, has not yet been in operation a full year, and to say that the success is so great that an immediate further advance is justified, seems to me to show a rather unstatesmanlike frame of mind.

My dismay does not come from that fact either, but from the reported attitude and reply of the Government of India, and it is to that matter that I want to draw attention. Sir William Vincent, it is reported,

“acknowledged the success that had been achieved by the Councils and the assistance they rendered the Government, but pointed out that the despatch of August 20 and the Government of India Act laid down that the grant of a further measure of political advance must be decided by

the Secretary of State for India and by Parliament, and asked if it was likely that after a brief experience of the reforms extending over only nine months Parliament would be prepared to accept the proposal now before the Assembly."

That is exactly what you would expect Sir William Vincent to answer. But that is not how the matter ended. The report continues—

"Eventually the Government suggested that the wishes of the House would be met if an undertaking were given that the Viceroy would be requested to convey to the Secretary of State the view of the Assembly that the progress made by India on the path of responsible government warrants the re-examination and the revision of the Constitution at an earlier date than 1929."

I must confess that I read that report with nothing less than dismay. The least that can be said about that is that it is a very equivocal attitude for the Government of India to adopt.

It may be argued that there is no pledge there, or even indication of intention, to re-open this question of the Constitution before 1929, but I venture to make this prophecy without the slightest hesitation, that many Indian members, and many Indian gentlemen, will point to this and say, "Oh! the Government led us to believe that they might be prepared to re-open this question before 1929." I am convinced that the wise and statesmanlike thing to have done would have been to have said, quite definitely, that it had always been agreed there should be no re-opening of the question for ten years from 1919, and that that had been, and was, the policy of the Government of India. If the majority of the non-official members of the Assembly had chosen to pass a Resolution in a contrary sense, that would have been entirely within their constitutional rights, but the responsibility would have rested alone upon them, and I deeply regret that the Government of India should have given any kind of indication that, in any circumstances, it would be prepared to pluck up the plant which was just growing, before its roots had had time to form, and to re-open this question before the end of the ten years.

What is ten years for the experience of an experiment such as this? I say without hesitation that there is no other civilised people in the world who would think that nine months', or twelve months', or even twenty-four months' experience was sufficient experience in a matter of this gravity. It is not the way in which we have passed from constitutional develop-

ment to constitutional development in this country. We have always, by universal national instinct, agreed that each stage should have a far longer period than appears to be popular with some of our Indian fellow-countrymen. I regret that they should take that view, but what fills me with dismay is that the Government of India should give them any encouragement.

LORD SUMNER: My Lords, at this hour I want to put two points only to the noble Earl before he replies. Lord Middleton asked that he should give us certain assurances, if he could. May I add to those assurances that some consolation be given to us with regard to the Calcutta case of Messrs. Kernani and Bannerjee. The discussion has been so discursive, and at the same time so informing, that I almost hesitate to go back to one point which may seem to be a small one. At the same time, it is one of those practical matters as to which nobody can really feel any doubt. Whether he may be on the side of the reforms or against them, whether he may be content to pay the price of a very uncomfortable time in the process of winning the political classes to co-operate with the British Government or not, one thing is quite clear—namely, that a repetition of such an incident as the Kernani and Bannerjee case, as I understand it, must undermine the authority of the Government and must discredit British rule in India.

Let me remind your Lordships for a moment what it was. I do not assume that these men were guilty, because they were not prosecuted, but they were charged with swindling and fraud, by which large sums, in connection with munitions, were obtained from the Government of India, and so far was there a case resolved upon, and prepared and proceeded with, that the Advocate-General of Bengal declared, obviously with as much sincerity as annoyance, that he believed that he had a case, of which one may say the least when one says that it was a strong case that should have been tried. No one who knows that gentleman's experience at the Bar in England will doubt that he was fully competent to form a judgment as to whether it was a case in which there was a reasonable prospect of obtaining a conviction. That prosecution was abandoned.

Now, again, I do not want to say anything that I can avoid saying about Sir

Thomas Holland, because he has resigned. His resignation, I understand, has been accepted, and it may be said that, as far as he is concerned, the chapter might well close. But just see what the explanation given was; because I say that until an explanation like that is finally and for ever repudiated it is quite incredible that the administration of justice in Bengal can be in safe hands. These people who were connected with the agitations of which we have heard apparently were concerned in a number of joint stock companies, in which a considerable number of their enthusiastic and agitated followers had invested their modest savings. And the reason given for not proceeding with the prosecution was that if these persons were convicted and went to gaol the conduct of these companies would come to an end, the money of the investors would be lost, and there would be very grave discontent—and so, I dare say, there would have been. The companies cannot have been very substantial if the abstraction, or the temporary segregation, of their two chief men in consequence of their conviction was to bring the whole edifice to the ground; and I imagine that therefore the savings invested in these companies would probably be lost, or will probably be lost, in any case. But, be that as it may, that was the motive as I understand it—I get my information only from the papers—the avowed motive for the action which Sir Thomas Holland took, with the concurrence of some of his colleagues.

It is not enough to allow a thing like that to pass into oblivion: it is a thing which ought to be repudiated. When Sir Michael O'Dwyer and other officials under him have, as I am glad to hear the late Viceroy say, earned the approbation and the support of the Government of India, if it is, nevertheless, necessary to season that approbation, and to modify the satisfaction that might be derived from it by pointing out where they were in error, still more is it necessary, when such an excuse as this has been offered as their reason for their conduct in the case of Kernani and Bannerjee, that in the most public way, and so as to close this incident for ever, it should be made perfectly well known that there is no one too small to be protected, and no one too great to be brought to justice for his crime.

That, at any rate, is a principle upon which any person interested in the Govern-

Lord Sumner.

ment of India can feel that he stands with firm feet, and I trust that the noble Earl will not merely say to me, as he is justified in saying, that in the hands of a Viceroy of vast legal experience, sound judgment, and calm intelligence, no such thing would ever be likely to happen again, but also that it should be firmly and definitely repudiated as a thing that can no longer be possible in connection with the administration of India.

I wonder if I may make another appeal to the noble Earl, only because he is faithful unto the end, and the noble Marquess who leads the House, called away by more serious duties, is not in his place. Does he think that he could suggest to the noble Marquess who leads the House that it really is not necessary to admonish your Lordships to preserve decency and decorum in debate; that the choice of our adjectives might just as well be left, as it was left in Lord Sydenham's case, to the circumstances which they describe? It was the facts of Lord Sydenham's speech, not any single adjective that he used, that lent colour to a most interesting address. And it would be certainly a satisfaction to those of us who have few things more at heart than the dignity of the House and the prestige of its debates to feel some assurance that we shall not be told another time to mind our p's and q's.

I have some difficulty in believing that the patient and placid contentment of India goes so far as to take an interest in the debates in your Lordships' House, but we were told that words falling from us lightly here, to which nobody ever pays any attention in this country, find their echo in the distant plains of Hindustan. If that be so—and, coming from such an authority, I feel it must be so—I think it is the experience of us all that our language is carefully chosen, and that we are prepared to pursue the path of moderation, even at the price of the sacrifice of all liveliness in our discussions.

LORD MESTON: My Lords, may I interpose for a very few moments not to weary your Lordships with questions of detail, but to invite your attention to a wider aspect of the case, which is sometimes overlooked, and certainly was not emphasised in the speeches of the two noble Lords who initiated this discussion? Whatever else we may disagree upon we are certainly all agreed that the times in India

are difficult, particularly for those on whose shoulders rests the responsibility for the administration of Government, and we do not want to add in any way whatsoever to those difficulties. But what I suggest to your Lordships is that we do materially increase the difficulties of those who serve in India if we do not have a precise understanding of the very complex and difficult issue that has been in their minds, and has been the crux of their whole life and duty during the last few years.

A good many years ago, in a very brilliant essay on Imperialism, the late Lord Cromer pointed out how slow the ordinary Englishman is to understand, how reluctant he is to admit, that in dealing with subject nations there are only two principles of government, and that the domination over those nations must be based on one or other of these as its sole foundation. One principle is military domination: the other principle is the right of people to manage their own affairs. In India it is the declared policy of His Majesty's Government that we should move, slowly it may be and by stages, still that we should move definitely, from the one principle to the other; and we cannot always be dragging out the former principle and brandishing it before the world, because, if we did, it would be difficult for the world to believe, particularly difficult for India to believe, and in time it would be difficult for ourselves to believe, that we do mean to press on towards the goal which we have set out and professed to accept as our goal in Indian affairs.

During a time of transition such as is happening now, when momentous changes are affecting a vast area and an immense population, it is inevitable that there should be some confusion, much unsettlement, and much perplexity. And the only solvent for that confusion and that unsettlement is patience, infinite patience. Here I venture to describe the broad issue that has been constantly before the rulers of India during the last few years. It is not an issue between strength and weakness, as our critics so often try to make out. Strength is all very well in its way, and, when you have got a large Army at your side and a docile people below you, strength is remarkably easy, and in some quarters remarkably popular. But there is something better than that. The real issue is between strength and patience. There have been times and seasons in the

course of the world's history when strength and patience mean the same thing, and I believe, and I ask your Lordships to believe, that such a time has been during the last few years in India.

Now, let us try to understand exactly and precisely what is the purpose of those who have been trying to destroy the peace of India ever since the Rowlatt Act agitation at the beginning of 1919. The Rowlatt Act was only a pawn in their game. What they hoped was, and what they still hope is, to make the new Constitution impossible. Why? They hoped to make it impossible because they believed, and still believe, that it will be the means of binding India closer and by a more durable tie to Great Britain even than it is to-day. The whole of their energies have gone out to prevent that. Their plan has been to embark on all sorts of provocation, threats of lawlessness, and enticement to crime, in the hope that they would force the Government into a policy of retaliation and repression, and that through that policy it would become impossible for us to fulfil our promises; that our policy should completely break down, that we would be shamed in the face of the world, and that ultimately India, alienated from us by our failure, alienated in every class of its population, would embark upon the task of getting rid of us by red revolution. That is definitely the programme and the hope of those people who have been trying to wreck the peace of India during the last three years.

I ask your Lordships once more to believe that the remedy, the only real and true remedy in the hands of the rulers of India, against that programme and against that policy is infinite patience and infinite tolerance which, I believe, has been already justified to a very large extent by the manner in which the people are coming forward and co-operating with the Government in action against those very firebrands whom they would otherwise regard and shield as heroes and as martyrs. I do not pursue this matter into any further detail because that will be done much more capably that I can pretend to do it, and with much more knowledge, by the noble Earl, the Under-Secretary of State. But I was anxious that your Lordships should judge India and the Indian administration of recent years not by whether a particular noisy demagogue was clapped into prison or another one was interned under a *lettre*

de cachet, but with reference to larger issues and to that larger vision which the situation demands.

Before I sit down I wish to make an appeal to the noble Earl, the Under-Secretary of State, and in doing so I find myself in unison, I think, for the first time on Indian affairs with the noble Lord, Lord Amptill. While the Government in its high places and the extremists in their recesses are planning strategy and working out large political issues, the poor public servant in the districts is being squeezed between two mill-stones. On the one hand, he is expected to show loyalty to the new *régime*, and I know that he does it. On the other hand, even those who are most loyal and most anxious to help the new *régime* are being badgered and attacked, not exclusively by the extremists but too often by those who ought to know better, and to the trials of the climate are now being added the trials of growing impoverishment to-day and anxiety as to the future.

The Indian Civil Service never required heartening and encouragement from your Lordships so much as it does to-day. The Joint Committee, as the noble Earl, Lord Midleton, has pointed out this evening, made definite recommendations regarding their adequate protection in the execution of their duties, and those recommendations were—I think I speak with approximate correctness—converted into definite pledges at the time when the Bill was before Parliament. What I appeal to the noble Earl to do is to re-affirm, if he will, those measures of reasonable protection and to give to the public Services in India reason to believe that those measures will be carried out in the spirit as well as in the letter. I do not suggest, for a moment, that there has been, or that there is likely to be, bad faith, but I can assure your Lordships that there is a genuine feeling of apprehension among the public Services that the Government may find itself forced into a position in which it will be unable, however willing it may be, to fulfil these pledges to the full.

I hold in my hand a letter which I received recently from a young member of the Service to which he and I belong, and from which I would ask the permission of the House to read a very few sentences. This is what he writes—

“For the last two years the Service as a whole has been asking in vain for proportionate pensions. If the Government do not understand the depth

and intensity of feeling in the Service upon this point they are very badly advised. If they are afraid to grant us the right to retire on proportionate pensions whenever we choose for fear of a general stampede, then they are entirely ignorant of the facts of the case. We all of us want the right of retiring on proportionate pensions; not 1 per cent. of us want to retire *now*. . . . The fact is—”

and this, I think, is a very interesting and encouraging statement—

“that for the great majority of us the conditions at present are not intolerable, and we have no intention of exchanging our work for idleness at home. But the gnawing anxiety which we suffer in feeling that a time may come when we shall either have to resign and starve or remain and serve under impossible conditions is the whole explanation of the *malaise* which you and other observers have noted. . . . Our forebodings have been increased by recent events. It appears that the Secretary of State has held out a tentative offer of immediate retirement on proportionate pensions to civilians of between fifteen and twenty-five years' service. It is, however, understood that the offer was prompted solely by the hope that certain undesirable officers would seize the opportunity to relieve Government of service which it did not require, and that as the only civilians who asked to be allowed to avail themselves of the offer were one or two men of the best type, the offer has been withdrawn. In other words, we are told that if we serve Government well we shall *not* be granted a proportionate pension when we want it, but that if we serve Government badly we shall obtain that privilege. Can you wonder that the Service suffers from *malaise* when every civilian knows that good work binds him irrevocably to this country to endure whatever fate may bring, while bad work will earn him the inestimable privilege of retiring on a proportionate pension whenever he wishes?”

I do not vouch for the exact accuracy of what is written by a man far from the centre of Government, but it is symptomatic of the feeling among an intelligent and, I believe, a loyal Service. As they have done splendid work for India in the past, I trust they will not be now left unprotected.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (THE EARL OF LYTTON): My Lords, after what has fallen from the noble Marquess who leads the House, I do not propose to say anything more about the wisdom in the public interest of holding this discussion to-day, except this. In asking for a postponement of the discussion the Government were in no way actuated by a desire to avoid criticism. There was no disposition on their part to refuse to this House full and ample opportunity of discussing the whole aspect of the present situation in India. But we had more ground than I think the noble and learned Lord, Lord Sumner, seems to appreciate in making this request. For

Lord Meston.

reasons which were partly explained by the noble Marquess who leads the House, but which could not be fully explained or discussed in this House—reasons, however, which I think were quite clearly explained in private correspondence—we did not desire to have this discussion to-day, and we did appeal to noble Lords who had Notices on the Paper to postpone for a short period (and that was all that we ever required) the discussion which they desired to institute.

The noble Lord, Lord Ampthill, explained to your Lordships that he considered himself under no obligation to meet us in this way, because the matters he was going to raise were matters which could not in any way affect the public interest or the visit of the Prince of Wales. But I made an appeal to the noble Lord to postpone his Motion for the reason that I was not in possession of information which I desired to give him, and for which he asked, and which I assured him I would be in a position to give him next week. When that was the position in which the Government were placed, I think that they were entitled, having regard to the universal courtesy which your Lordships extend to Ministers when they make these requests, to expect that the Motion might have been postponed.

So far as Lord Ampthill's four points are concerned, on two of them, for the reasons I explained, I am unable to-day to give him any information. With reference to the question of retirement on proportionate pensions, I have already assured him that the Government of India and the Secretary of State fully accept the recommendations made by the Joint Select Committee, and are in favour of extending fair and generous terms to men who desire to retire because they cannot conscientiously carry out the new scheme of reform. The noble Lord is not entitled to think that the delay in issuing those proposals is due to any weakness in that determination, and is not, let me assure Lord Meston, from fear of a stampede or from any failure to realise the intensity of the feeling on the subject. The delay arises solely from our desire to do the very thing that Lord Ampthill has pressed us to do—namely, to lay down a scheme and fix a scale, which will be fair, and, I hope, not ungenerous, of pensions on which it will be possible for men to retire in the circumstances to which I have referred.

All this, however, is a financial matter of very considerable detail and intricacy, necessitating continuous correspondence by telegram with the Government of India. I hoped that I might have been in a position to announce to your Lordships this week the decision arrived at, but I am not able to do so. The Secretary of State, I believe, has announced in another place to-day that he hopes to make a statement on this subject either this week or early next week. As soon as we have the information we shall lay it before Parliament, and it will then be for your Lordships to express your opinion as to whether or not you are satisfied that we have carried out our promise. But do let me assure both my noble friends that that, and that alone, is the reason for delay in producing the scheme.

On the question of the Moplah rebellion, it is our intention immediately to produce a White Paper and lay before Parliament in that form a full and detailed account of all the proceedings in the matter up to the present time. Therefore, I hope to be able on those two points in the near future to satisfy Lord Ampthill. Papers, as I have explained, will be produced on those two matters. With regard to the other two, I will say a word, but I am not in a position to produce any Papers.

Lord Ampthill raised the question of what he describes as some land belonging to a Mr. Grant. The noble Lord obtained his information, I have no doubt, from a newspaper account, and I do not, therefore, hold him responsible for the fact that the account was somewhat inaccurate, and an *ex parte* statement. Your Lordships are probably unaware, though my noble friend Lord Ampthill from his Indian experience knows, that a great river like the Ganges is, at some parts of its course, as much as seven miles wide between the two banks, but the river itself only occupies in that extent of seven miles the comparatively narrow space of one mile, and on each side of this one mile there is a very large, very rich and valuable alluvial deposit. These alluvial grounds have in India from time immemorial been the subject of the most acute controversy and dispute. The difficulty of deciding their ownership was experienced long before the British ever were seen in India. This question is almost as old as the Ganges itself, and the case to which my noble friend referred was just one of those matters where there was a dispute as to the

ownership of some of this alluvial soil. It was represented in the newspaper from which my noble friend obtained his information as a property to which Mr. Grant was legally entitled, and of which others wished to dispossess him.

Stated in that form it would naturally be very misleading to your Lordships, but, from the explanation that I have now given, I beg your Lordships to understand that this particular incident is one of many that have occurred throughout Indian history, one which presents very great and particular difficulties and one which has no connection whatever with politics or the present political situation. No doubt it will be used by those who think that any stick is good enough with which to beat the Government, and who think that any kind of discontent or riot—because in this case there was considerable riot with great loss of life—is further proof of the iniquities of the Government and of its policy. But this question, I emphasise, has nothing whatever to do with politics or the present political situation in India.

Lastly, there is the Calcutta munitions case to which Lord Ampthill referred, and to which reference was also made by Lord Sumner. I see the noble and learned Lord is not in his place, but if he were here I would ask him to imagine what were the feelings of the late Lord Chief Justice in this country when he learned of the action taken by one of his Council, and the reasons alleged for the withdrawal of the prosecution in this case. Your Lordships may readily believe they were the feelings that would have been experienced by Lord Sumner himself if he had been placed in such a situation. It is not necessary to ask me for a repudiation of the cause of the withdrawal of that prosecution, because such a repudiation has already been given by the Viceroy himself. There has never been any question about his attitude on the matter. Having in view his great legal experience and traditions he regarded with the utmost dismay the announcement that was made by a member of his Council, and had no alternative in such circumstances but to accept the resignation of Sir Thomas Holland. Not only has the Viceroy dissociated himself wholly from the reasons given, and not only is that shown in the resignation of Sir Thomas Holland, but he has also taken steps to ensure that the circumstances in which such a decision was given without consultation with him can never again be repeated.

The Earl of Lytton.

There is nothing new about that case that I can say, and there are no Papers which I can lay. The suggestion, if I understood Lord Ampthill aright, that we should lay before Parliament Minutes of the Viceroy's Executive Council is one which I was much surprised should have come from him. You may equally fairly ask that we should lay before Parliament Minutes or decisions of the Cabinet in this country. All the facts regarding the case have been stated in public; the opinion of the Viceroy about it is known; and with the assurance I have now given I hope your Lordships will be satisfied that we have said all that can be fitly said on the subject.

The noble Earl, Lord Midleton, asked a question which I confess I was a little surprised that he should put to me as a kind of bargain in consequence of the fact, as he described it, that we had obtained immunity from discussion. That is just what we have not obtained. We asked that the discussion should not take place, but your Lordships decided otherwise. I am surprised that the noble Earl should call upon the Government—

THE EARL OF SELBORNE: The noble Earl did not make his speech.

THE EARL OF LYTTON: If the noble Earl intended to make a speech and refrained, and if this speech would have been of an embarrassing character, I can only express my gratitude to him. Not in any spirit of reciprocity but because it is perfectly easy for me to do so, I will at once give the noble Earl the assurance he sought. He asked that the subject of the Civil Service should receive attention. I have already dealt with that matter and need say nothing further about it.

The noble Earl also asked for an assurance with regard to the Indian Army. There has been a good deal of misunderstanding on this matter, and some of it appears in the speech of Lord Sydenham. The position with regard to the Indian Army remains exactly where it did when I gave an assurance on the last occasion in this House to Lord Sydenham. There have been no recent reductions in the Indian Army. As I stated previously the question as to what the future strength of the Army should be has been referred to a Sub-Committee of the Committee of Imperial Defence, and

until that Committee has considered the question and made its Report no action will be taken. I hope your Lordships will feel that we could not refer to a higher or better authority the question which the Secretary of State has declared is the guiding principle of his policy—namely, not what Army can we afford, but what Army is necessary for the protection, external and internal, of India, and when we are informed what Army is necessary we shall take steps to provide the means to maintain that Army. The question of what Army is necessary is now under consideration by the Committee of Imperial Defence, and I can only repeat the assurance that no action will be taken until that Report has been obtained.

THE EARL OF SELBORNE: Can you give us any idea when it is likely to be received?

THE EARL OF LYTTON: The Committee of Imperial Defence has just begun its sittings. It is considering the matter at the present moment, but I am afraid I cannot say how long its discussion is likely to take.

LORD SYDENHAM: Will the House have an opportunity of discussing it?

THE EARL OF LYTTON: I am not in a position to give any pledge on the matter. The Committee has not made its Report; the Cabinet has not considered it; and it is premature at this stage to carry the matter any further.

I should be quite content to leave the question of the present situation in India as it was left by the very able and weighty speech of Lord Chelmsford. That we should have had a speech from so influential an authority is, as Lord Selborne said, a great advantage to this House. I cannot add anything to what fell from Lord Chelmsford, but I must make some comments from the point of view of the Government, lest it should be thought that the Government shirked discussion of the matter. I must enter a protest on behalf of the Government at the attempt made by Lord Sydenham in his speech to represent India as if it were seething with rebellion and sedition, as if it were disloyal and in a state of agitation from one end to the other; and further to describe the Govern-

ment of India as a weak and timid Government which has lost all authority.

Above all, I must protest against what I think was a most ungenerous and cruel suggestion, that officers in the Indian Service to-day could not count upon the loyal support of the Government which they served. Lord Chelmsford has dealt with that and stated how groundless is the suggestion. Surely no one will contend that loyal support to your servants is to be carried so far as to mean that in all cases, whether your subordinates did right or wrong, they are to be supported. There has been nothing in the action taken by the Government of India in the past in dissociating itself from wrong or misguided action, to justify the statement that servants in India, whether civil or military, cannot count upon the full support of the Government in any action they may take. The noble Lord, Lord Sydenham, dates all India's troubles from the pronouncement of 1917. He took us back to that date to-day, and he said that from the moment you announced your intention to associate Indians in the Government of their own country, and advancing by gradual stages—

LORD SYDENHAM: I beg the noble Earl's pardon. I went back to 1916; the proclamation of Indian Home Rule by Mrs. Besant in 1916.

THE EARL OF LYTTON: I beg the noble Lord's pardon, but neither the Government of India nor the Secretary of State can be made responsible for that proclamation.

LORD SYDENHAM: No.

THE EARL OF LYTTON: I am speaking about the responsibility of the Government, and I do not think I have misquoted the noble Earl when I say that, so far as the responsibility of the Government is concerned, he considers the first mischievous step was taken in the pronouncement of August, 1917. From that, he said, followed immediately the wicked Act of 1919, an Act to which he is constantly referring in publications in the Press as a disastrous Act. He says that as a result of that Act we have set up a number of political assemblies in which nobody takes any interest in India, and he went on to explain that, because of the little interest taken, only

some one-fifth or one-fourth of the electors could be persuaded to come to the polls. That is but one instance of the readiness of those who disapprove of this policy to quote anything which they consider will strengthen their case. The Government has published a White Paper setting forth in great detail the results of the Indian Elections.

The noble Lord in the remarks which he has just made has not analysed the figures of the returns at those Elections. He has apparently not noticed the covering preface to that White Paper, in which it is explained what were the principal reasons for the small vote in certain districts. He did not tell your Lordships that in great parts of India the electors attended very fully, and that in some cases as many as 50, 60, and even 75 per cent. of the electors went to the poll; and that if you could withdraw the small proportion of voters in the Mahomedan urban districts, which was directly attributable to the Caliphate agitation and the Mahomedan grievance of which I will speak in a moment, the attendance was somewhat higher and not lower than was to be expected, considering that it was the very first Election.

But, says Lord Sydenham, we have set up those Assemblies, in which "nobody takes any interest"; we have encouraged a mere handful of seditious persons to defy the law; the Government is too afraid of this mere handful of persons to proceed against them, but in hopes of appeasing them we have reduced our Army; in consequence of this nerveless and feeble Government, rebellion is spreading over the land, life and property are no longer safe, the law is openly defied, and both political power and military force are slipping from our grasp.

That is the truth which Lord Sydenham thinks it is necessary that your Lordships should know, and before saying anything by way of contradiction of this fiction of his imagination, I should like to pause and ask the noble Lord this—If that is his reading of history, if that is the picture of India which he sees to-day, then what is his remedy? Presumably, if the noble Lord had his way, he would repeal the Act of 1919; he would apologise for the mistaken pronouncement of August, 1917; he would abolish all these silly Councils in which nobody takes any interest; he would double or perhaps treble our military

The Earl of Lytton.

forces in India, and put everybody into prison who ventured to criticise his Government. Then, when you have stifled all the political emotions and aspirations of the country, when you have crowded your troops into India, and when you have filled your prisons, then, says the noble Lord, a sigh of relief will go up from one end of India to the other, and every one will be happy. I can only say that it is lucky for India that the noble Lord is not in a position to apply his remedies.

He says, and other speakers in this debate have repeated, that Parliament is responsible. I do not deny it for a moment. We do not wish in any way to deprive Parliament of its responsibility in this matter, and let me assure the noble Lord that, if and when he can get Parliament to adopt his view and instruct the Government to apply his remedies, the present Government will cease to exist.

I am not going back at this stage to defend the policy of the Government of India Act, but as this debate may be read in India, I cannot refrain from saying, as shortly as I can, that not only has the Government never considered the question of going back on the Act of 1919 and has not the slightest intention of applying a different policy, but that, in our opinion, in spite of the very great difficulties under which it was inaugurated, this new Constitution has worked quite as well as could have been expected, and that, looking at the result of only one session in the Assembly, in the Council of State and in the various provincial Assemblies, there is every reason for the Constitutionalists in India to be pleased at the work which those Assemblies have done. They have a high tribute of praise from a very competent authority.

The President of the Legislative Assembly in India is a man of very long experience of Parliamentary life in this country, a man with a very high political reputation, and no one, I think, could be in a better position to judge how the Assembly over which he presided had worked than Mr. Whyte. At the end of the first session of this new Parliament, Mr. Whyte paid a very high tribute to the wisdom, the sense of responsibility and the respect for constitutional procedure which the Assembly had shown. In the opinion of His Majesty's Government, the tribute which Mr. Whyte paid was very well deserved.

Let me pause here to say one word in reply to Lord Selborne, because it is in consequence of that tribute from Mr. Whyte that the members of the Legislative Assembly expressed the wish that a further instalment of responsible government might be given to them. I do not think that the noble Earl is quite justified in the dismay with which he read the account of that debate—I think “dismay” is the word he used—

THE EARL OF SELBORNE: Dismay at the attitude of the Government of India.

THE EARL OF LYTTON: At the attitude of the Government of India in that debate. The outcome of that debate was a suggestion by the Government of India that they should forward to the Secretary of State the wishes of the Legislative Assembly that it might not be necessary to wait for ten years before considering a further extension. The noble Earl is quite right. It was, I think, clearly the intention of the Joint Select Committee that there should be two sessions of the new Parliament, one complete Parliament of four years, then a General Election, and that before the end of the second Parliament, a Statutory Commission should be set up, and that that commission should report as to its working. We should, therefore, have a report of the Commission before the end of eight years, and that examination will take place after six or seven years' experience of the working of the new Constitution.

I submit to my noble friend that time is only an important consideration in this matter in so far as it is necessary to provide experience, and were it proved by experience that there was a defect in the existing Act which Parliament in its wisdom had not foreseen, and that that defect required remedying, I do not think that any Secretary of State would be debarred by that understanding from coming to Parliament and pointing out what the defect was and asking for its remedy. It is certainly the intention of the Government that if there is to be any change in the Government of India before the Statutory Commission contemplated in the Act makes its Report, it must be as a result of proved experience and not merely because demands are made by any individuals. Therefore, although for the reasons which I have just mentioned I

cannot give my noble friend any pledge that if experience proves it is necessary to come to Parliament for a change no Government will come, I can give an assurance that no Government will come to Parliament to change the Government of India Act unless the experience of working it has proved a change to be necessary.

I may be asked, after I have spoken of Lord Sydenham's picture of India as a fiction of his imagination, whether I am completely satisfied with the position in India. Nobody who knows the situation there can be foolish enough to state that he is satisfied with it. It would be impossible to deny that the situation in India continues to give very grave anxiety, both to the Government in India and to the Government at home, and, in particular, there is one feature to which no reference I think has been made in the discussion to-night, but which is really at the root of most of the trouble in India, and that is the Mahomedan discontent, caused by the Treaty made with Turkey at the end of the war. That Mahomedan discontent is the backbone of the Non-cooperation movement, the explanation of the boycott of the Councils, and the reason why the small polls are chiefly to be found in the Mahomedan areas. It is that which led to the Moplah outbreak, and I expect Lord Chelmsford would agree with me that there is no one thing which could bring greater relief to the Government of India than the knowledge that a satisfactory peace had been arranged between Greece and Turkey.

The reason why I maintain that this Mahomedan agitation is wholly unjustified is because it is common knowledge that the Government of India has never lost an opportunity of representing to the Government at home the necessity, if it were possible, of securing a satisfactory peace in that part of the world. What, however, the Mahomedans in India apparently fail to realise is that the satisfaction of their demands in this matter does not rest with the Government of India, or with the Imperial Government, but that this is a matter which is of concern to all the Allies who signed the Treaty, and has to be considered not only in relation to Mahomedan feeling in India, but to the obligations of His Majesty's Government to their Allies, and their other international obligations.

But, as I have said, that is a root cause of much of the agitation in India at the present moment, and it is that which has led to the Moplah rebellion, and Lord Chelmsford said quite rightly that no one can talk lightly of that very serious rebellion. It is a rebellion which has caused the most serious anxiety to the Government of Madras, and I should like to take this opportunity of stating that His Majesty's Government have complete confidence in Lord Willingdon, the present Governor, and his Government, in the steps which they are taking to deal with this rebellion. The fact that the Government of Madras is able to deal with it at the present moment is, I think, a further proof of the success of that very policy which Lord Sydenham has condemned, because the Government of Madras is able to-day, as it could not have done before the Act of 1919, to rely upon not only the support of the people of Madras, but upon an Assembly in which the sentiments and opinions of a completely loyal Province can be expressed by purely constitutional means; and there is no doubt whatever that, in spite of this revolution, generally speaking the whole Province of Madras is entirely loyal and giving support to its Government.

I have no further information to give to my noble friend, Lord Amptill, on this question, although I have assured him that the Government intends immediately to publish a White Paper giving the fullest information. There is, however, one matter referred to which I should like to correct. It was stated, I believe by both noble Lords, that the garrison at Malapuram was withdrawn some time previous to the outbreak of the rebellion, and I think Lord Sydenham told the House that that was a consequence of the reduction of the Army in India. My information is that the troops were returned to Malapuram just before the outbreak, and that there was a garrison at that place when the rebellion broke out. That is the information which I have received, but if I am wrong in that matter and it is true that troops were not there when the outbreak took place it was not because of the reduction in the Army; it was not because there were not troops available. At the present moment there are more British troops available in India for civil disturbances of this kind than there were before the war. In 1914 there were in India for these purposes one British Cavalry regiment and twenty-four British Infantry battalions, and in February, 1921,

The Earl of Lytton.

there were three Cavalry regiments and twenty-eight Infantry battalions, and if there was no garrison at Malapuram it was not due to the fact that the Army had been so reduced that troops were not available.

I want to say only one word in conclusion about the policy of the Government. Our view is that in spite of the Moplah rebellion, and in spite of the Non-cooperation movement, the great mass of the Indian people are entirely loyal. That they are loyal is due, as Lord Chelmsford has pointed out, to the passage of the Government of India Act, 1919, and to the policy of which that Act was an illustration. Instead of that Act being responsible for the Non-cooperation movement and the Moplah rebellion and other troubles in India, had it not been for the policy which has been so bitterly criticised by Lord Sydenham the troubles of the Government of India to-day would have been very much greater.

The point which I want to make to your Lordships is this—that the policy of the Government is of necessity a dual policy. It involves two features, in both of which I ask for the support of public opinion in this country. One is that we should with complete sincerity carry out the Declaration made in 1917, of our desire to help the Indian people by gradual means and successive stages to approach to complete self-government. The other is that it is our duty to the law-abiding and constitutional people in India to uphold the law with firmness and impartiality and punish law-breakers and disturbers of the peace. The difficulty in which the Government is placed is that, whereas it requires support for both parts of its policy, it is too apt to receive support only with regard to one of them by these different sections of opinion in this country.

Those who, like my noble friend Lord Sydenham, are always urging the Government to take more vigorous action in enforcing the law, are at the same time always telling the public of their complete disbelief in the policy embodied in the Act of 1919. And those who assure us of their belief in that policy, and who make a profession of their sincerity in supporting that policy, are apt too often to be lukewarm in the support which they give to the Government when it is necessary to enforce the law against law-breakers. And

therefore I have no right to expect support from Lord Sydenham, who never conceals the dislike which he has to the whole of the policy of the present Government in India; but I would appeal to those of your Lordships who do render support to His Majesty's Government that you will give us equal support in those two branches of our policy which cannot be dissociated, and must stand and fall together.

The attack which the noble Lord has made upon the Government for its present administration in India must necessarily embrace all the Governments of India at the present time; and, though I am perfectly prepared at any time to answer any criticisms which the noble Lord may bring against His Majesty's Government, I appeal to your Lordships to do nothing and say nothing which would imply a want of confidence in those who are charged directly with responsibility for administration in India. The noble Marquess who leads the House has told your Lordships that we have been recently in daily communication with the Viceroy and his Government on administrative matters. The Viceroy also is in continuous communication with the Provincial Governments. And if anybody thinks that either the Government of India or the Provincial Governments have been deterred by instruction from the Secretary of State at home, from taking any action which they think necessary, I hope that belief will be dispelled by the words which Lord Chelmsford has used in this House. He has assured your Lordships that whilst he was responsible for the Government of India the Secretary of State at no time sought to interfere with his discretion, or to send him instructions as to how he was to behave in purely administrative matters.

That has been the policy of the Secretary of State throughout, both with Lord Chelmsford and with his successor. He has at all times made it perfectly clear that any action which the Government of India, or any Provincial Government, thought it their duty to take in the direction of enforcing the law or preserving order will receive the whole-hearted support of His Majesty's Government. Since we have expressed our confidence in the Viceroy and Provincial Governors I would end by appealing to your Lordships also in this very difficult and anxious situation in which

they are placed to extend to them the confidence which their administration deserves.

LORD AMPHILL: My Lords, I have still to make my Motion for Papers. The Papers for which I desire to move are: In the Kernani case, Papers showing how the decision to withdraw the prosecution was arrived at, and Sir Thomas Holland's reasons for his action; in the Grant case, Papers giving the order to prosecute Mr. Grant, and the judgment of the Court; as regards the Public Services, the Regulations as to proportional pensions for premature retirement, and the scales for the same; and, as regards the Moplah rebellion, the correspondence between the Government of Madras and the Collector of Malabar, and between the Madras Government and the Government of India. I beg to move.

THE EARL OF LYTTON: I am willing to accept this Motion on the understanding that it is left to the discretion of the Government as to what Papers they will lay on the Table. If, by a Motion for Papers, is meant an undertaking on behalf of the Government to lay before Parliament all the Papers referred to by the noble Lord I could not, of course, accept his Motion. I have informed him that on two of his points I hope to lay Papers very shortly, but that on some of the other points I am unable to comply with his wishes. There has been no Notice on the Paper, and there is not now any Motion on the Paper for specific Papers. I am informed by the learned Clerk at the Table that it is necessary, according to the Rules of the House, to move for specific Papers, and it is not possible, therefore, for the noble Lord to make a general Motion for Papers. If he will withdraw his Motion, I have given him an assurance that on certain matters I am prepared to lay Papers. If the noble Lord wishes to put down another Motion for laying the Papers to which he has referred I shall not be able to accept that.

LORD AMPHILL: I am content with an assurance that such Papers as can be laid will be laid. It was only to conform to the Rules of the House that I specified the Papers I wanted. In the circumstances, I withdraw my Motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 27th October, 1921.

CIVIL AVIATION.

LORD MONTAGU OF BEAULIEU had given Notice to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Air, if, in view of the termination on 19th and 21st October of the agreements under which the temporary cross-Channel aerial service is now maintained, he can give information as to any arrangements come to with civil aerial transport firms for the continued operation of services between London and the Continent; and whether there is a chance of agreements being made and subsidies being paid for the establishment of inter-Imperial services.

The noble Lord said: My Lords, I have raised this Question to-day from several points of view, one of which is that on October 19, I think, the present arrangements between the Government and those who run the cross-Channel services by air came to an end. I understand that last March £50,000 were allocated as a subsidy towards helping these services, and that that money is now more or less exhausted. Since then, as we have seen from a White Paper just issued, the Government have entered into a new form of contract with two of the parties concerned, and although I do not care to express much opinion upon the wisdom, or otherwise, of that course at the moment, it is quite clear that to maintain these services, which I hope to show are very essential to us from many points of view, some kind of subsidy is necessary.

I think there can hardly be any doubt as to the desirability of maintaining commercial air services. We may compare them now, in value to this country, to the maritime services of various liners during the war, inasmuch as they formed a very useful reserve for the Admiralty to draw upon. If we had not had many of those ships available to be fitted up as cruisers, it would have been very much more difficult to maintain control of the sea. If, in this case, we were to allow Civil Aviation to fade away, so to speak, we should undoubtedly weaken our position from a naval point of view. Therefore, from the point of view of national defence, some subsidy for these services when in their infancy is justifiable.

All over the world other nations are maintaining air services, all of them, so far as I know, subsidised in some form or other. In some cases the service subsidised is a postal service, and in some cases it is paid per mile run or in other ways. In Germany the factories are entirely free from taxation. Therefore, it is clear that other nations besides ourselves realise the great importance of maintaining regular air services in addition to the ordinary naval and military establishments. At the present moment, to mention a few of these services, France maintains a postal service to Algiers and several internal services as well. All over Germany there are internal services arranged and to be arranged. The United States is very keen to establish further lines and further services, and has a considerable number of aeroplanes in daily use. In Spain lately the Spanish Government has been trying to purchase two German airships, to start a route between Spain and South America. In Japan, also, great interest is being taken in aviation, and in fact one may say that in every nation of the world that is likely to be involved in any struggle in the future, it is realised that commercial aviation must be assisted, in order that there may be a larger supply of machines and pilots in case of trouble.

It has often been said in this House, and I think in the other place as well, that the best way of subsidising air services is by asking the Post Office to use them for postal purposes. I thoroughly agree with that view. Those who said that the Post Office was not justified in doing it at first, because it does not pay, forgot that a great many of the postal subsidies in other forms could not be justified on a strict economic basis. I believe that something like £400,000 a year is paid for the mail service to India, and I do not suppose that anything like that amount of profit is derived from that service. The Post Office also pays for services to the Cape and other parts of our great Dominions, and I suppose that hardly one of those services pays, if it is taken by itself. The general policy has been that it is desirable to make the services between the Mother Country and her great Dominions as rapid and useful as possible, and therefore there has been a general policy of helping lines which run a moderately good and fast service to distant points.

I suggest that the same policy should be adopted in the case of the air. The policy

at the present moment, I gather, is only to subsidise cross-Channel services. I have seen no indication on the part of the Government of an intention to subsidise any inter-Imperial service, or service which would pass over a part of the Continent and the Mediterranean and give facilities to Egypt, Mesopotamia and possibly India. But I hope to hear from the noble Lord, who I am glad to see on the front bench, when he answers for the first time for the Air Ministry, something about inter-Imperial air services and whether there is any chance of such services being established. Of course, it was a sad thing when the airship service came to an end, and that that magnificent body of men and valuable material had to be dispersed, but much as I believe in airship services, and greatly as I think they will be the long-distance means of aviation, I realise the pressure of finance and I see how it was that the Air Ministry could not continue the airship service in view of that pressure.

Because R. 38 collapsed, with a loss of life which we all deplore, we must not think that airships are things of the past, or that they have been proved to be a bad method of conveyance. Accidents happen, and always will happen, when you are going through any experimental stage of transport. We all remember that the early ships were not particularly seaworthy, and in the early days of trains there were far more accidents than there are to-day. The early days of motor cars had the same feature. Therefore, we must not think that, because of this unfortunate accident, there is any reason why airships should not in future take their place at any rate among the methods of long-distance communication with the outlying Dominions of the Crown.

As regards the Channel services, they have been extraordinarily successful. During the six months ending September 30 last there have been some really remarkable records. At present there are two British and two French services and one Belgian and one Dutch service in operation, and they have flown in the six months well over half a million miles—to be exact, 526,621 miles. It is a noteworthy fact that not a single passenger was killed or injured during that period. In the five months from May 3 the total number of passengers was 7,862, an average of 1,572 per month, or about 400 passengers a week. Of those the British machines carried 3,560 pas-

sengers, and the French 3,340. I am glad to be able to inform your Lordships that in point of reliability the British machines were far ahead of the French machines on every occasion. The British machines were Messrs. Handley Page's, which had 96 per cent. reliability, and the Instone Company's machines, which had 95 per cent. In the past seven weeks the Handley Page machines made eighty-four flights all of which were accomplished without any troubles, and there was only one stop, which was due to fog. No claims were made upon the underwriters, which is really the commercial test of safety. In the six months the two British companies flew 135,490 miles, and the French companies 176,362 miles.

Thus, in the period of six months ending September, we arrive at this remarkable result, that no passenger was killed or injured, and only two passengers were slightly hurt on one occasion, which was, I believe, due to fog. I admit that this summer has been an exceptional one in regard to weather, and that there has been an absence of strong winds and fog. The facts I have given, however, show to what degree of popularity these cross-Channel services are attaining when we get an average of something like 400 passengers a week during the summer. I do not believe that at the present moment any cross-Channel service could be put on a strictly commercial basis. Two of the companies are, I think, approaching the point at which they will be commercially successful, but at the present moment none of them could pay its way. The French Government subsidises its machines very heavily—much more heavily than we do, and yet they are not nearly so reliable. I do not wish to depreciate the excellent work done by the French, but there is no doubt that in their machines the factor of safety is lower, and their load is proportionately higher, and that makes a good deal of difference when we are considering the commercial aspect of these matters.

I hope the noble Lord who will reply for the Air Ministry will be able to give us some comfort to-day with regard to the future of these services. The figures I have quoted point to the conclusion that more and more people are being converted to the use of aircraft for travel, and that next year the number of passengers will probably reach a figure which will warrant serious commercial enterprise. At the

moment, the outstanding factor is the struggle between the French and the British companies for traffic between London and Paris. Both the British and the French companies realise that in the future there may be a great chance of making the services a commercial success. Also, both countries appreciate the fact that to maintain the progress of design and the increase of efficiency these regular services are necessary. As a matter of fact, military and naval supremacy in aeronautics will, in my opinion, depend very largely on the assistance given to Civil Aviation at this stage.

In view of the fact that overhead charges form such a large proportion of the expense of the carrying companies, I hope, for my part, that no more companies will enter the field at the present moment. Any great multiplication of companies on the London-Paris route must tend to hamper business. It is better to assist two or three approved companies on a comparatively generous scale than to assist other companies which might come into the field. In the early stages of developments of this kind a certain number of people are willing to put up money, hardly expecting a commercial return, and doing it out of enthusiasm, or more or less as a hobby. In the end those people disappear, and the firms which run their business on a commercial basis must be those which will carry on the business in the long run.

I hope the noble Lord will be able to assure us that the Government are giving this matter very serious consideration. We must remember that, although aviation does not command the attention that it did during the war, if there should be another war aviation will be a much more serious factor in our national safety. Experiments have recently been made by nations in the sinking of battleships by bombs—the bombs not necessarily falling on their decks, but alongside of them—and there have been some very important results reached. I have no doubt whatever that aircraft in the future—at any rate, at the beginning of a war—will be the most formidable means of attack, and therefore we must have a formidable means of defence.

I have pleaded in this House before for attention to this subject, and your Lordships have always received me very kindly. I do so now deliberately, because at the present time, when there is no longer the same thought expended upon aviation as

Lord Montagu of Beaulieu.

there was a little time ago, Governments and Departments are very apt to neglect vital issues. We must never allow our commercial aeroplanes to disappear. Their maintenance is most important, and in case of war they would be invaluable.

THE EARL OF CARRICK: My Lords, before the noble Lord replies on behalf of the Air Ministry I should like first of all to endorse what Lord Montagu of Beaulieu has just said about the commercial air services. It is most important that the commercial air services should be put on a thoroughly sound business basis, and it is to be hoped that all the pilots engaged in those air services will be maintained as Air Force reserves. It has been suggested by the noble Lord, Lord Montagu of Beaulieu, that only the two companies which are now carrying between London and Paris should be retained, and that other companies should not be brought into consideration at present. At this moment trade is in a very depressed state, as we all know. Those who chiefly benefit by the quick transit by aeroplane are the merchants and traders of the country. By degrees the quick passage between Paris and London will be taken advantage of more and more by the commercial community of both countries, and, with an increase of trade, I think we may look for a large increase in the number of passengers carried between the two capitals. There will always be a certain number of passengers who will make the journey by air for the excitement of it, or who want to get from one place to another rather more quickly than is possible by other means.

Is this the right moment to bring into the field several companies who will draw a subsidy from the Government in order to test which of them is best able to carry out that work in the future? Would it not be advisable for the Government to consider the question of subsidising only two companies at the moment? As the passengers increase and the demand grows from day to day for more flights, then is the time to consider the question of including other companies, when the subsidy, granted *en bloc* to the carrying companies, can be distributed among them in proportion to their respective carrying capacity. It also seems to me that the apportionment of any subsidy should be made on a reduced sliding scale rather than that a lump sum should be given *en bloc*, because it is hoped

that the number of persons availing themselves of aerial transport in the next two years will be greater than during the coming season.

In regard to the subsidy itself, I hope we shall receive an assurance from the noble Lord who replies that the portion to be given to the carrying companies will be very largely in relation to their carrying capacity, and that the subsidy will not be utilised as a capital grant out of which they will be paid for their machines and will repay the Government on the hire purchase system. It ought to be the business of the companies themselves to provide the necessary machinery with which to comply with the Government's requirements.

Then, again, there is the question of the machines which are now in use. If such subsidy as may be given is used for the purpose of providing new machines and those now in use by the carrying companies are to be scrapped and new ones to be put into the service, it seems to me that it would be regrettable if those machines which have been thoroughly tested and, as you have heard from the noble Lord, Lord Montagu of Beaulieu, have travelled in carrying out their duties over 500,000 miles with scarcely a mishap, should also have to be scrapped and new ones put in their places. The other point is that if the Government controls an industry the Government should pay for the losses sustained by that industry in its initial stages. Therefore, I press it upon the Government that they should base the subsidies on a sliding scale, making them larger for the first year and coming down in proportion until the end of the period for which they are granted.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR AIR (LORD GORELL): My Lords, we have had a most interesting speech reviewing commercial aviation in its widest aspects from the noble Lord, Lord Montagu of Beaulieu, who has been associated so long with every form of transport, and a number of questions on details of the subsidy scheme. The noble Lord gave certain figures rather with reference, so far as I could gather, to the volume of flying in countries generally. I may be able to supplement some of those figures with a definite account of the complete work done under the first part of the subsidy scheme.

Your Lordships may remember that the whole idea of the subsidy is founded, first

of all, on the Report of the Advisory Committee, presided over by Lord Weir, which recommended a subsidy of 25 per cent. on gross receipts. But in March of this year, mainly owing to the very largely increased subsidies which were being given for Civil Aviation by the French Government, the British companies were finding it almost impossible to compete, and there was a very great danger that no British aeroplane would be able to compete at all successfully on a commercial basis. In consequence of that position a Committee was set up, as promised in another place, which consisted of my noble friend the Marquess of Londonderry, the Controller-General of Civil Aviation, and Sir James Stevenson. Their first duty was to try to bring in some scheme, with as little delay as possible, which should enable the cross-Channel service to be maintained against French competition. They formulated a scheme, which was admittedly of a temporary character, with Messrs. Handley Page and the Instone Air Line, the two firms who were then in a position to carry out a service. The terms have been published in the Command Paper which has just been issued and I need not go into them in any detail.

But to supplement the figures given by Lord Montagu of Beaulieu, I would like to state the total numbers carried by the British and French firms respectively since that temporary scheme came into operation; that is, for seven months. The one scheme ended on October 19 and the other on October 21, and the two British firms have carried from London to Paris in that time 2,356 passengers, and from Paris to London, 2,140, making a total of 4,496. The French have carried from London to Paris, 1,861, and from Paris to London, 2,081, making a total of 3,942. These figures are, I think, a rather striking justification of the terms of the subsidy under the temporary scheme, when we consider that in March we were almost in the position of doing nothing at all. •

I think they are worth analysing a little further, and I would like to give the figures for the first half of October: Carried by British machines, 149 passengers in 25 machines—that is an average, roughly, of six passengers to a machine—by the French, 52 in 36 machines, an average of 1.5 passengers; and from London to Amsterdam the Dutch carried 11 passengers in 11 machines. For the other way, from Paris to London, the figures are: The

British carried 130 passengers in 24 machines, or an average of 5·4 passengers; the French 84 in 35 machines, or an average of 2·4 passengers; the Dutch 12 passengers in 11 machines. During the part of October to which I have referred there were no Belgian aeroplanes flying, in view of the fire at the Belgian aerodrome. The point of the figures that I have given is that though the British are really flying fewer machines they are carrying a considerably larger number of passengers, and throughout the whole seven months period I can amply confirm what Lord Montagu said that there has not been a single casualty, which is rather striking testimony to the growth of safety in the air commercially.

I should like to endorse generally all that the noble Lord said with regard to the mails, but he will realise that it is a difficult matter to place mails upon a contractual basis. It means long negotiation with the General Post Office, but we do find now an increasing disposition on the part of the General Post Office to recognise the possibilities of aerial transport. The greatest factor in the cost of mails is the cost of handling, and it may be a considerable time before we can get contracts for carrying mails by air at the same rate as by land. But if the cost is additional for air transit, there have been carried, in the period under review, an average of 380 lbs. weight of mails per month for six months—that is, roughly speaking, 4,940 letters per month. An interesting and encouraging feature is the development of the parcel service which was inaugurated as recently as July 12. In July there were 216 parcels carried; in August, 363; and in September, 489. Those are the figures for the part of the scheme which ended with the termination of the agreements of October 19 and 21, but the work of the Committee was devoted all through to the idea of trying to bring into operation a scheme on a more permanent basis. It sat regularly, and took a great deal of evidence from many people connected with the aircraft firms.

I am concerned rather directly with Civil Aviation, which has been under my attention, and have been chairman of the Committee since July. It has now formulated a scheme which we hope to maintain for the next three years. The first point is that we are setting aside a sum of £200,000 per annum on this cross-Channel subsidy scheme. As a result of the negotia-

tions and the evidence laid before the Committee, we issued a communication to the Press on June 15, giving certain lines on which the scheme was to proceed. There are two main points—first, that the Air Ministry should order machines of proved types, which will be hired out to firms to augment their existing fleet; and secondly, the Air Ministry will pay subsidies on a basis of 25 per cent. to approved firms on gross receipts from carriage of passengers, goods and mails taken on any of the three routes—London–Paris, Brussels, and Amsterdam. The machines were to be insured by the companies. They would be hired out to the company at a monthly rental of 2½ per cent. of the cost of the machine, and after the thirtieth payment they were to become the property of the company—that is to say, at 75 per cent. of their cost. Other conditions were that *personnel* was to be of British nationality, and the aircraft and engines of British manufacture and design. In order to qualify for the subsidy any company approved was required to make a minimum of forty-five complete single journeys in each direction during each period of three months.

The Committee had a number of inquiries from a considerable number of firms and—this point has been referred to by both noble Lords who have spoken—the Committee had to consider how far it was justified in approving more than the two firms that had been operating in the past. There are arguments both ways, but, in view of the volume of traffic that was to be expected, the Government decided that it was not justifiable to limit the approval to the two firms only. At the same time, they thought that it was not possible to extend approval at all widely. We had, further, to consider the suggestion that has been made in the past of the formation of a national company, but after full consideration we decided that that was not advisable in the interests of the development of Civil Aviation.

The negotiations which have been taking place with the firms that seem to be in a position to carry out a scheme in future have been very protracted, and the more evidence that was laid before the Committee, the more obvious did it become that it was impossible, upon the conditions issued on June 15, for those firms to carry on in the future without a very serious risk of financial loss, which they were not pre-

Lord Gorell.

pared to undertake. Nor was it the desire of the Government to press them unduly, for the interests of both were to develop Civil Aviation as far as possible. As a result, the Government have made certain concessions, until, at any rate, the end of February, 1923, and are prepared to make a grant of £3 per passenger and 3*d.* per pound on mails and goods carried.

The next question was that of the insurance for machines. It has been decided that the Air Ministry will bear 50 per cent. of the insurance premium of the hired-out machines, subject to its contribution not exceeding 10 per cent. of the value of those machines. One other point of considerable difficulty is the question of the return of machines if it becomes at all apparent that their types are being superseded by newer types. Noble Lords will realise that here the interests of the firms and the interest of the Government are really one and the same, the whole object being to keep in the air a service based upon those machines which will develop in their design the latest and best methods of aviation. There are still certain details to be threshed out with the firms, but the Government are prepared to agree that machines, if returned in an air-worthy condition, will be taken back, after no fewer than eighteen monthly payments of 2½ per cent. of their value, and will be replaced by the latest machines if the Air Ministry is satisfied that the change is desirable.

Though all details have not been settled, and full agreement has not been reached with all the firms concerned, we hope that at the beginning of March next there will be three firms running between London and Paris, and one between London and Brussels. The arrangements we hope to make for a firm between London and Amsterdam are, for the moment, in abeyance owing to the exceptionally strong position of the Dutch company there.

It was hoped that this three years' arrangement would be brought into operation immediately on the conclusion of the temporary agreement which concluded on October 19 and October 21. That, I am afraid, has not been possible for two reasons. The firms, not unreasonably, were unwilling to commence the services on a durable basis after the conclusion of this wonderful summer and at the beginning of the winter. Further, the negotiations have been concerned with so much detail

that it was never certain until recently that they would come to a satisfactory point, and until they had done so it was impossible for the Government to place orders for the new machines. As a result, it has been necessary to renew the temporary agreements with the two firms who have carried on this summer for services during the winter. They will carry on until the end of February next year, and the maximum Government liability will be reduced according to the shorter time.

There is one remark I should like to make with regard to the whole of these schemes. I think it is generally admitted that without some subsidy of the kind indicated the firms and the cross-Channel services would not have continued. But I do not think that we should regard any subsidy scheme as necessarily of an absolutely permanent character. I do not like, in general, the idea of subsidies; and I think the policy of the Government is clearly stated by the Committee presided over by Lord Weir, to which I have referred, where they say—

“We record at the outset that we should in no case contemplate the continuance of such assistance (direct assistance) as part of the permanent policy of the State. We have dealt with it solely as a matter for consideration during the present critical years when the fortunes of British Civil Aviation hang in the balance.”

While that is admitted, there is no doubt that it was an absolute necessity to preserve the cross-Channel services, because the advantages of commercial flying, which have been stated by the noble Lord, are advantages which it is the duty of the Government to develop as far as it can.

We have to contend in England with certain disadvantages. We are a country where the distances are comparatively short; we have an excellent network of railways, and we are not always favoured with very good weather. In maintaining these services across the Channel we are doing something to break down the innate conservatism of the British mind towards anything new and demonstrating daily the practicability of air transport. It was hoped at one time that Civil Aviation would undergo a boom, but it has not. Nevertheless, the total amount of flying is steadily on the increase. The figures for the quarter ending June 30 last are—4,985 machine flights, with only three accidents and only one which had fatal results. That is for the whole of civil flying, including the cross-Channel services. I am not so familiar

as the noble Lord with the days of early motoring, but I think this ratio of accidents to flights will compare favourably with the early days of motoring.

I would emphasise the point that in their regard for these services the Government are vitally concerned with the development of Civil Aviation and that the Secretary of State for Air has that development keenly at heart. It is true that the primary responsibility of the Air Minister must be the defence of the country, but it is a mistake to suppose that Service and civil flying are rivals. They are really mates, and there is a good deal of ground which is common to both in which each may help the other.

The noble Lord has asked me a specific Question with regard to the development of other routes, especially inter-Imperial routes. He will realise that the amount of money at our disposal is limited, and after full consideration the Government consider it prudent to concentrate all their limited resources upon maintaining, and if possible developing, the cross-Channel routes rather than dissipating them over a number of routes which it might not be possible afterwards to carry to success. I think it is by no means agreed that a general scheme of subsidies is the best means of assisting the development of Civil Aviation. The policy which the Government are pursuing is that the development, though it may be encouraged and assisted by Government, cannot either be operated or initiated by them and that the true foundation for a healthy industry is in civil enterprise.

At the same time, we are not neglectful of the inter-Imperial side. There, I think, co-operation between the Service and the civil side can be of direct assistance. There will be an example within the next few days of the way the Service will come in with regard to the carrying of mails. The mails for His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales will be caught up at Alexandria by a Service aeroplane and taken across to Suez in time to catch His Royal Highness in H.M.S. "Renown." We are constantly using Service aeroplanes for mail services from such places as Bagdad. The most recent example is that in which a Service aeroplane carried six bags of mails and saved eighteen days upon the ordinary route.

I feel that the possibility of attempting to establish inter-Imperial routes is not

one which can be greatly assisted by subsidies. In the outlying parts of the Empire it is the work of the Service side to "blaze the trail," so to speak; establish the routes and safeguard them. I hope I have said enough to show that from rather a serious position in March we are now though not by any means developed as fully as one might hope, on the pathway of development, and that the cross-Channel services will be established on a successful and, I hope, increasingly successful, basis in the ensuing year.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Wednesday, 2nd November, 1921.

INDIAN MUNITIONS BOARD CASE.

LORD SYDENHAM had given Notice to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India—

1. What is the total sum involved in the alleged frauds on the Munitions Board?
2. What are the business concerns with which the accused persons were connected when the prosecution was ordered?
3. Whether the prosecution of the European subordinates is proceeding.

The noble Lord said: My Lords, I put the first Question last week to the noble Earl and I gave him private notice at the time, but he did not then reply, being naturally encumbered by a great many other things that he wished to say. I have put the Question down again because I think that he would wish to have an opportunity of giving me an answer. I understand that under Indian law only three instances of fraud can be dealt with in one prosecution. I am told that the total sum involved is considerably larger than that which has been stated. That is the explanation of my first Question. As regards the second Question, it has been stated in the Indian Press that Mr. Kernani, at the time of the prosecution, was associated only with a land bank, with a paid-up capital of six lakhs of rupees, and that Mr. Bannerjee was a contractor on a very large scale and also associated with some coal mines, which certainly would never have shut down had he chanced to be convicted. I hope the noble Earl will clear up that very important point, and I beg to put my Questions.

Lord Gorell.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (THE EARL OF LYTTON): My Lords, in the first place I should like to apologise to my noble friend for not having given him this information on Tuesday. He will remember that a great many speeches were made and several questions were put. I am afraid that when I came to reply I overlooked the specific point of which my noble friend had given me notice. With regard to the first Question my noble friend has put down, we do not know the total sum involved in all these frauds. In the one case against Kernani and others, in which the prosecution was withdrawn against Kernani, Bannerjee and Stringer, the value of the property involved was about one lakh of rupees.

Secondly, my noble friend asks what are the business concerns with which the accused persons were connected. In the case referred to there were four persons accused. One, named C. S. Waite, had been Deputy Controller of Munitions. Another, H. Stringer, was a subordinate official. Mr. Kernani is the managing director of the Kernani Industrial Bank, an institution which is understood to finance a number of minor industrial undertakings. Mr. Bannerjee is also connected with various industries in Bengal. Sir Thomas Holland was informed, as a ground for requesting him to withdraw the case, that the bank financed 120 concerns, and, from Press messages, it appears that the maximum available capital of the bank was £300,000.

With regard to the third Question, as already stated, the European subordinate, Mr. Stringer, was discharged, but against Mr. C. S. Waite, the former Deputy Controller, who is still on bail in England owing to illness, the prosecution still stands, and there is another case also pending in which four other Europeans are jointly accused with him. That is all the information which I have bearing on the subject which I am able to give my noble friend.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 8th November, 1921.

REPORT OF IMPERIAL MEETINGS.

LORD VERNON: My Lords, in the unavoidable absence of Lord Strachie I desire to put the Question which stands in his name on the Paper—namely, to ask His Majesty's Government whether they will publish the Report of the proceedings

of the last Imperial Conference as a Parliamentary Paper as they did in the case of the Imperial Conference of 1917.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (THE EARL OF CRAWFORD): My Lords, in connection with the Imperial meetings which took place last June and July, it is not proposed to publish anything beyond what has already been given to the Press—namely, "The Summary of the Transactions of the Prime Ministers and Representatives of the United Kingdom, the Dominions and India, June, July, and August, 1921," a Paper which was approved by the Empire representatives for publication, and issued to the Press on August 5 last. This Summary was also published by the Colonial Office in Command Paper 1474, together with various appendices giving the opening speeches of Ministers, Mr. Balfour's statement on the League of Nations, the Report of the Air Committee, and memoranda on such things as Oversea Settlement, Empire Patent, Nationality, and so on.

Although in many quarters the meetings last summer have been referred to as the Imperial Conference, it was not strictly speaking an "Imperial Conference" such as has been held previously, and was more in the nature of an Imperial Cabinet. The term "Imperial Cabinet" was, however, objected to in some quarters and was consequently avoided, the designation generally adopted being "Imperial Meetings." At the previous Conferences, which have been called "Imperial Conferences" (as opposed to the "Imperial War Cabinet" which was held during the war), there has been really nothing confidential about the questions under discussion, and in many cases it has been an advantage rather than otherwise to publish the records of the discussions. This was not the case with the recent Imperial meetings, when most of the discussions were of a very secret and confidential nature, dealing as they did with questions of foreign policy, defence, and the like, the publication of which would not be in the public interest.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 10th November, 1921.

SUKKUR BARRAGE SCHEME.

LORD SYDENHAM had given Notice to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India

whether it has been decided that the barrage and the new canals in Sind are to be commenced simultaneously; and whether the Government of India and the Secretary of State have satisfied themselves that—

1. It is safe to disregard the opinion of the Committee of 1913 that these great works should be completed, not commenced, at the same time.
2. It is practicable in a sparsely populated country like Sind to complete works costing about 18 crores of rupees within a period of ten or twelve years.
3. The cost of these works and of their maintenance has not been greatly under-estimated, having regard to the immense rise of wages, etc., in India.
4. Grave unrest may not be caused in such a district as Larkana, where fine rice crops are now grown, by a rise of 60 per cent. in the rate of assessment.

The noble Lord said: My Lords, any great irrigation work in India involves questions, technical, economic, social, and political, which could not profitably be discussed in this House. I therefore ask your Lordships' pardon if I detain you for three minutes for special reasons in regard to this great Sukkur project. I was familiar with the project in 1912, which I studied on the spot, not only as a Governor but as an engineer. I have not studied the new project which is now under consideration, but I know enough about it to understand the great misgivings with which some very able engineers who know Sind feel about it. The expert Committee of 1913 was forced to the conclusion (these are their words) that "a barrage at Sukkur was necessary," which is perfectly sound; but then they laid down that "If the complete scheme is ever undertaken both canals and barrage should be simultaneously completed."

The reason is obvious. An enormously costly work like the barrage should be built as completely as possible, and should be finished at the moment when it becomes immediately reproductive. If these conditions are not fulfilled then the interest charges mount quickly to very serious proportions. The population of Sind has fallen off since 1911, and it is now under 3,500,000. I doubt very much whether

labour can be found in sufficient amount to carry out these huge works in the time which is anticipated in the project. The present rice rate, including the second crop, is 5 rupees, but under the scheme there will be an increase of this rate for ten years to 8 rupees, and, after that, 9 rupees for another period of ten years. This great increase must be regarded as a terrible grievance by the cultivators, especially as they would not get a larger water supply than they have at present.

As regards the estimates, the project of 1912 was to cost 8 crores only. The present project is to cost 18 crores, and is to be completed in eleven years, and the Government of India, in their Dispatch dealing with these estimates and with the increase in rates, stated that they had provided for an increase of 20 per cent. above pre-war standard. And, as regards the head works generally, the Government of India said—

"We are, however, satisfied it is not necessary to provide for so large an increase as 30 per cent."

I entirely distrust that estimate. The ruling rate in Bombay before the war was 4 annas; it is now 10 or 12 annas; in Sind it may be somewhat less, but I am convinced that these estimates require most careful revision.

I raise these Questions now because this great project, if it is economically carried out, will be of enormous benefit to Sind, and also to India as a whole, but if any mistake has been made, or if, as I think, there has been some slight misunderstanding somewhere, the effect will be disastrous in the present rather critical financial position of India. All that I ask of the noble Earl is that these four Questions which I have put down might be looked into again, to see if there is not something in the remarks I have made.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (THE EARL OF LYTTON): My Lords, I quite agree with my noble friend that a Question of this sort, involving highly technical considerations, cannot be discussed with any advantage in your Lordships' House. My noble friend as an engineer may be able to enter into these details, but if he were to do so I certainly should not be able to follow him, and I have no intention of making anything like a detailed defence of this particular scheme. I understand that he is really concerned,

.. Lord Sydenham.

and, I think, quite rightly concerned, to know that all the facts of the problem have been before the Government of India and have received full consideration before the decision to create this barrage was arrived at. On this point I think I can reassure my noble friend absolutely.

Not only has the whole matter—including the site of the barrage, also the relative dates of commencing the barrage and the canals, and all these matters—been exhaustively considered since 1913, but even in the last few months the arguments and proposals of Dr. Summers (who, as my noble friend knows, is one of the chief opponents of this scheme) have been considered by the Government of India and their technical advisers, with the result that the scheme proposed by Dr. Summers was unanimously rejected by the present advisers of the Government of India, and the scheme which it is proposed to carry out has been unanimously reaffirmed and supported.

I have nothing really to tell my noble friend beyond what I was able to say in replying to the noble Lord, Lord Lamington, in August—namely, that so far as the technical side is concerned that matter is now decided, and the Secretary of State is not disposed either to reopen it or to seek any further advice. He could only be justified in doing so if he were not satisfied with the competence of the engineers who advise the Government of India, or if there was any difference of opinion between them. Since he is satisfied that they are men of the highest engineering reputation and with the latest experience of irrigation works, and since they are unanimous in their opinion, having up till quite recently considered all the arguments that have been made, he is not prepared to reopen the matter.

On the purely engineering side of it, therefore, all these questions have been fully considered and a final decision has been arrived at. But, as I told Lord Lamington in August, there are aspects of the case which are financial rather than technical and some which are partly financial and partly technical, and it is really mainly those particular aspects to which my noble friend to-day has referred. I agree with him that there are reasons for reconsidering the estimates upon which the whole scheme was based, and there are several financial aspects of the scheme upon which the Secretary of State was not

satisfied which he has referred back to the Government of India and which are under the consideration of the Government of India at the present time. Therefore, so far as the financial aspect of the scheme is concerned, that has not yet received final approval, nor has the date for the commencement of the carrying out of the scheme been decided.

The Government of Bombay, as the noble Lord, I am sure, will readily understand, believing this to be a scheme fraught with the greatest possible benefits to Sind, are anxious to begin at the earliest possible moment. The only reason for delay is the necessity which he has pointed out of giving the most minute scrutiny not only to the technical aspects of the case, which have been decided, but to the financial provisions. Though I am not prepared to enter into any detailed discussion of this scheme in your Lordships' House, I think that persons who, like Lord Sydenham and Lord Lamington, are deeply interested in the proposals, are entitled to have a full explanation of what the case for the Government of India is, and though the matter is not of general interest, it is of great interest to the few who are acquainted with the project.

I propose, therefore, to place in the library of your Lordships' House the Despatch of the Government of India of December, 1920, and the Secretary of State's Despatch of June 16, 1921, which will be available for any of your Lordships who care to refer to them. The Despatch of the Government of India will give the whole of the case for the erection of the barrage, and the Despatch of the Secretary of State will contain his reasons for agreeing with the Government of India that, in its technical aspects at any rate, the scheme should be approved. Those two documents will also be placed in the library of the House of Commons, and I hope that any members of your Lordships' House who are sufficiently interested in the scheme as to require further information will find there all the information which they could desire.

LORD SYDENHAM: My Lords, I beg to thank the noble Earl for his answer to my Questions. I gather from it that practically all the four points which I have raised, being really of a financial character, will be looked into again. I am very much obliged to him for promising to lay information upon the library table.

HIS MAJESTY'S SPEECH.

And afterwards His Majesty's most gracious speech was delivered to both Houses of Parliament by the Lord Chancellor (in pursuance of His Majesty's Command) as followeth—

My Lords, and Members of the House of Commons,

The Session of Parliament which closes to-day has been marked by events of great importance to the welfare of the British Empire and to the peace of the world. It is not yet possible to say that peace is firmly established in Europe, and it must be long before the world can recover from the strain and sacrifice of the War; but good progress has been made towards the solution of the most critical problems of home and foreign affairs.

I have welcomed with deep satisfaction the Prime Ministers of the Dominions and the Representatives of India, who have been in Conference with My Advisers here. They had questions of great moment to discuss in common and grave decisions to make. Their presence for that purpose has been invaluable, and I trust that it may be found possible to arrange regular meetings of a like character for the further exchange of views and the discussion of common interests.

Their deliberations on foreign policy dealt in particular with the problems of the Pacific and Far East and with the questions arising out of the Empire's obligations under the Treaty of Versailles and the other Treaties of Peace. I am happy to know that on all these issues My Governments here and oversea are in close accord.

The Conference gave serious attention to the defence of the Empire and to the maintenance of an adequate measure of sea-power. It was unanimously decided that the naval strength of the Empire should be equal to that of any other Power.

As a result of the proposals made by the Allied Powers to Germany last May and accepted by her, satisfactory progress has been made by the German Government in the execution of their financial and disarmament obligations under the Treaty of Versailles.

A serious rising of the Poles in Upper Silesia led to the British troops, which had been withdrawn in April, being sent back, and after difficult and anxious negotiations the insurrection was overcome, and the authority of the International Commission was re-established.

The insurrection unfortunately delayed the negotiations for a settlement of the frontier, and at a meeting of the Allied and Associated Powers in Paris in August last, it was decided to invite the League of Nations to examine the whole question and to make recommendations for a settlement.

Those recommendations have recently been received, and steps are being taken to give effect to them. There is reason to hope that they will be loyally carried out by the two parties principally concerned, and that a peaceful and honourable settlement will result.

Peace has been definitely established between the Allied Powers and Hungary. The Treaty signed at Trianon on the 4th June, 1920, having been ratified by the British Empire, France, Italy, Japan, Belgium, Czecho-Slovakia, Serbia, Rumania, Siam and Hungary, the ratifications were deposited at the French Ministry for Foreign Affairs on the 26th July last.

The efforts, made by My Government at the Allied Conference in March and renewed in June, to establish peace in the Near East were in each case rendered fruitless by the renewed outbreak of hostilities between the Greek and Turkish forces in Anatolia. It is my earnest desire to see these hostilities followed by an early and just peace, and My Government are prepared, in conjunction with their Allies, to take the first opportunity of furthering this end.

I have followed with great satisfaction the steps taken by the President of the United States to promote the reduction of expenditure on armaments, an object which commands the fullest sympathy of My Government.

It was in this spirit that My Government gladly accepted the invitation extended by the United States Government to a Conference on Disarmament about to be held at Washington. It is My earnest hope that the labours of the Conference will be crowned with success.

Negotiations have for some time been in progress, but have not yet reached a conclusion, between My Government and a delegation nominated by His Highness the Sultan of Egypt with a view to determine the future relationship of that country with Great Britain.

Progress continues to be made in the reduction of expenditure in Iraq in accordance with the policy which has been explained in the House.

My son, the Prince of Wales, has embarked upon his Eastern voyage, and within a few days will land for the first time on Indian soil. I pray that his visit may still further strengthen the ties of affection which for so long have linked My house with the Princes and peoples of India. Upon the conclusion of his Indian tour he will proceed on a visit to the great and friendly Empire of Japan.

Members of the House of Commons,

I thank you for the provision for the Public Service. Although trade and commerce have been undergoing a period of unexampled depression, I learn with satisfaction that it is nevertheless anticipated that, while the estimated surplus for redemption of debts will not be realised, the financial year will end without a deficit on the Budget.

Our debts, however, are great, our taxation heavy and burdensome to industry, and revenue cannot be maintained on the scale of the last three years. It is accordingly of vital importance to the financial stability of the country that expenditure should be still further restricted in every department of life, both public and private. The Government will continue to take advantage of every possible means to achieve this essential object in the field of public expenditure, and I confidently rely upon My people in their own practice to support the efforts of My Ministers.

My Lords and Members of the House of Commons,

The situation in Ireland still causes Me great anxiety. I earnestly exhort the leaders of all Parties in Ireland, and all those in whose hands lies the power to influence the negotiations and discussions now proceeding, to exercise

patience and moderation with the object of establishing friendship and loyal co-operation between My people of that country. It is My firm belief, as it is My earnest prayer, that with forbearance and good will and with an honest resolve to tread the paths of oblivion and forgiveness, and enduring peace will finally be achieved.

The past summer has been notable for the occurrence of the most serious industrial conflict which has ever menaced the prosperity of the Realm. I take pride in the calm and serene spirit with which the trials of the coal stoppage were met by My people, and the freedom from strife and violence which characterised its course.

This dispute unhappily aggravated the adverse effect of the sudden world-wide trade depression, which has inflicted upon the industries of this country the most grievous experience in their history.

My Ministers have viewed with grave concern the continuance of the widespread Unemployment which has attended the cessation of trade. Accordingly you have within the past few weeks given close and detailed consideration to this problem. Measures have received My assent designed, first, to encourage the revival of industry by facilitating the provision of Capital for public undertakings and by assisting export trade, and, secondly, directly to provide employment on an extended scale by aiding Local Authorities and others to carry out various forms of beneficial works. Finally, in addition to the provision made by the Acts which you have already passed relating to Unemployment Insurance, a measure has been framed to assist in mitigating the sufferings of those who remain unemployed, by the provision, out of monies contributed by employers, employed and the State, of grants to wives and dependent children.

The peaceful settlement of many difficult disputes by mutual negotiation between employers and workpeople, together with some indications of a revival of trade, encourage My hope that the worst may be over and that the state of employment may show from

now onwards a steady, if slow, improvement. But the position is still full of anxiety, and My Ministers will continue to devote to this problem their vigilant care.

It is not, however, so much to Acts of Parliament as to the proved good sense of employers and operatives, working together for the promotion of their common interests, that I look for the restoration of trade prosperity.

My assent has also been given to measures for the reorganisation of the railways and for the safeguarding of

industry, and an Act for the Reform of the Licensing Laws has been passed with a universal and gratifying measure of agreement. But the legislation of the Session has been dominated by the difficult financial condition of the time. The imperative need for the avoidance of all fresh burdens and for the further curtailment of expenditure has required the modification of some measures already passed and the postponement to happier times of the completion of other reforms.

I pray that the blessing of Almighty God may rest upon your labours.

His Majesty's Speech.

INDEX

FEBRUARY 15—NOVEMBER 10, 1921.

EXPLANATION OF ABBREVIATIONS.

Bills: Read First, Second or Third Time = 1R., 2R., 3R.

Where in the Index * is added with Reading of a Bill or any other stage, it indicates that no debate took place on that stage of the Bill.

Afghanistan

Treaty with Bolshevik Russia reported, 70.

Amphill, Lord

British officials' position, 62.
Civil servants' proportional pensions, 184.
Exchange, causes of fall in, 17.
Harkishen Lal, position of, 57.
Government of Burma Bill, 2R., 43.
Imperial Parliament's powers of interference, 13.
Political situation, 216, 266.
Standing Joint Committee on Indian Affairs, personnel of, 65.

Army

Commissions held by Indians, 67.
Improvement of conditions, 17.
Strength reduction, 21, 80.

Aviation

Position regarding civilian services and Government subsidy, 267.

Birkenhead, Viscount—*Lord Chancellor*

Government of Burma Bill, 2R., 128.

British Mandates

Problems arising, 152.

British Officials

Position of, 62.

Business of the House

Course of, 193.

Buxton, Earl

Government of Burma Bill—Committee, 148.

Carriek, Earl of

Aviation—Position regarding civilian services and Government subsidy, 272.

Chelmsford, Viscount

Army—Strength reduction, 86.
North-west frontier, defence of, 110.
Political situation, 232.

Civil Servants

Proportional pensions, 184.

Clwyd, Lord

Government of Burma Bill—Committee, 141.

Cows

Slaughter of, 5, 10.

Crawford, Earl of—*First Commissioner of Works*

Government of Burma Bill—
Introduced and 1R., 20.
3R., 156.

Imperial Conference—Publication of Report requested, 282.

North-west Frontier, defence of, 96.

Crewe, Marquess of

Afghanistan—Treaty with Bolshevik Russia reported, 72.

Army—Strength reduction, 28.

Imperial Parliament's powers of interference, 13.

Curzon of Kedleston, Marquess—*Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs*

Business of the House, course of, 193.

Persia, political situation in, 174.

Political situation, 208, 213.

Emmott, Lord

Afghanistan—Treaty with Bolshevik Russia reported, 72.

Europeans

Protection of, 156.

Exchange

Causes of fall in, 14.

Gorell, Lord—*Under Secretary of State for Air*

Aviation—Position regarding civilian services and Government subsidy, 273.

Government of Burma Bill

Introduced and 1R., 20; 2R., 30, 125, 127; Committee, 139; reported, * 152; 3R., 156.

Government proposals as to, 76.

Harkeshen, Lal

Position of, 57.

Imperial Conference

Publication of Report requested, 281.

Imperial Parliament

Position as to discussion of Indian affairs, 59.

Powers of interference, 12.

Indian Divorces (Validity) Bill

Introduced and 1R., 96; 2R., 126.

Committee, * and reported, * 130.

3R., * 130.

Royal Assent, 156.

February 15—November 10, 1921.

Infants

Mortality, rates, 10, 11.

Islington, Lord

British mandates—Problems arising, 152.

Government of Burma Bill—

Committee, 139.

Government proposals as to, 76, 79.

King's Speech

Text of, 1, 287.

Lamington, Lord

Army—Commissions held by Indians, 67.

Government of Burma Bill, 2*r.*, 50, 130.

Persia, political situation in, 1, 68, 180.

Sukkur Barrage—Proposed scheme, 180, 184.

Lytton, Earl of—Under Secretary of State for India

Afghanistan—Treaty with Bolshevik Russia reported, 71, 73.

Army—

Commissions held by Indians, 67.

Improvement of conditions, 19.

Strength reduction, 26, 29, 91.

British officials, position of, 63.

Civil Servants' proportional pensions, 192.

Cows, slaughter of, 11.

Europeans, protection of, 161.

Exchange, causes of fall in, 15.

Government of Burma Bill—

2*r.*, 30, 50, 55, 128.

Committee, 144, 148, 149.

Government proposals as to, 76, 80.

Imperial Parliament—

Position as to discussion of Indian affairs, 59.

Powers of interference, 12.

Indian Divorces (Validity) Bill, introduced and 1*r.*, 96; 2*r.*, 126.

Infants' mortality rates, 12.

Munitions Board, frauds on, 281.

Nagpur riot, 74.

Nankana Saheb, affray at, 123.

North-west Frontier, defence of, 114.

Political situation, 252.

Rawlinson, Lord—Speech in India, 66.

Standing Joint Committee on Indian Affairs—

Personnel of, 65.

Proposal for, 4.

Sukkur Barrage—Proposed scheme, 182,

284.

Meston, Lord

Political situation, 248.

Middleton, Earl of

Army—Strength reduction, 28.

Government of Burma Bill—

2*r.*, 54.

Committee, 148.

Political situation, 230.

Montagu of Beaulieu, Lord

Aviation—Position regarding civilian services and Government subsidy, 267.

North-west Frontier, defence of, 96.

Munitions Board

Frauds on, 280.

Nagpur

Riot at, 74.

Nankana Saheb

Affray at, 121.

North-west Frontier

Defence of, 96.

Persia

Political situation in, 168.

Political Unrest

Increase of, 197.

Rawlinson, Lord

Speech in India, 66.

Revolutionary Propaganda

Spread of, 131.

Salisbury, Marquess of

Political situation, 212.

Selborne, Earl ofGovernment of Burma Bill, 2*r.*, 48.

Political situation, 243, 256, 257, 261.

Standing Joint Committee on Indian Affairs

Personnel, 64.

Proposal for, 4.

Stuart of Wortley, Lord

Afghanistan—Treaty with Bolshevik Russia reported, 73.

Sukkur Barrage

Proposed scheme, 180, 282.

Sumner, Lord

Political situation, 246.

Sydenham, Lord

Afghanistan—Treaty with Bolshevik Russia reported, 70, 73.

Army—

Improvement of conditions, 17.

Strength reduction, 21, 29, 80.

British Mandates—Problems arising, 154.

Civil Servants' proportional pensions, 189.

Cows, slaughter of, 10.

Europeans, protection of, 156, 167.

Exchange, causes of fall in, 14, 17.

Government of Burma Bill—

2*r.*, 38, 56, 127.

Committee, 142.

Government proposals as to, 80.

Harkeshen Lal, position of, 58.

Infants' mortality rates, 11.

Munitions Board, frauds on, 280.

Nagpur riot, 74.

Nankana Saheb, affray at, 121.

North-west Frontier, defence of, 106.

Persia, political situation in, 171.

Political situation, 197, 257, 258.

Rawlinson, Lord—Speech in India, 67.

Revolutionary propaganda, spread of, 131.

Sukkur Barrage—Proposed scheme, 282.

Tenterden, Lord

Cows, slaughter of, 5.

Infants' mortality rates, 10.

Vernon, Lord

Imperial Conference—Publication of Report requested, 281.

Debates on Indian Affairs.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SESSION 1921

(11 & 12 GEORGE V.)

[*From 17th February to 19th December, 1921.*]

COMPRISING EXTRACTS FROM

THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

OF ALL QUESTIONS, PROCEEDINGS, AND DEBATES RELATING
TO INDIAN AFFAIRS.

LONDON:

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY

HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE.

To be purchased through any Bookseller or directly from
H.M. STATIONERY OFFICE at the following addresses:

IMPERIAL HOUSE, KINGSWAY, LONDON, W.C.2, and

28, ABINGDON STREET, LONDON, S.W.1;

37, PETER STREET, MANCHESTER;

1, ST. ANDREW'S CRESCENT, CARDIFF;

23, FORTH STREET, EDINBURGH;

or from EASON & SON, LTD., 40 & 41, LOWER SACKVILLE STREET, DUBLIN.

INDIAN DEBATES.

SESSION 1921.

Thursday, 17th February, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

CIVIL PENSIONS.

Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS asked the Secretary of State for India why he has limited the proposal to raise the pensions granted from Indian revenues to pensioners of the various civil funds, such as the Madras Fund and the Bengal Fund, to widows and others whose total income does not exceed £150 a year; and whether he is aware that this proposal is preventing such people from supplementing their income by usefully earning a little money?

Mr. MONTAGU: The limit, though independently fixed, is the same as that applied under the recent British Pensions (Increase) Act in the case of unmarried persons or of widows with no children under 16 years of age.

Mr. MARRIOTT asked the Secretary of State for India whether uncovenanted Indian Civil Servants who retired on 23rd July, 1913, are excluded from the benefit of the increased rate of pensions granted to those who retired on or after that date; if so, the ground for this distinction; and whether he adheres to the terms of the circular letter issued by the Government of India on 23rd July, 1913?

Mr. MONTAGU: The increased rates of pension are applicable to officers retiring after the 23rd July, 1913, not to those who retired on or before that date. As regards the last part of the question, I would refer the hon. Member to the answer given by my right hon. Friend the President of the Board of Education, on my behalf, to a question by the hon.

and gallant Member for Melton (Colonel Yates) on the 28th October last. I will send the hon. Member a copy.

Sir A. HOLBROOK asked the Secretary of State for India when the present maximum pensions for European members of the Forest and Public Works Departments, as regards invalidation and service of 20 and 25 years, were first sanctioned; what increase in the above pensions was granted by the scheme introduced by the Government of India Finance Department Resolution 1,085 E.A. of 15th November, 1919; what percentage of European-recruited officers of the two Departments concerned with less than 20 years' service have not accepted the new scheme; and whether, in the event of acceptances being less than 50 per cent., he will consider the introduction of a fresh pension scheme more commensurate with the increased cost of living in England?

Mr. MONTAGU: The dates in question are 1884 in the case of officers of the Public Works Department, and 1893 in that of officers of the Forest Service. The maxima specified were not altered by the Resolution of 15th November, 1919. I have no information as to the percentage of officers who have accepted the new scheme. I understand that the Government of India are considering whether the present maxima for officers of these services retired after less than 25 years' service might not be improved in certain respects.

ARMY RESERVE OFFICERS (WAR DECORATION).

Sir A. HOLBROOK asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is prepared to acknowledge the services during the Great War of Europeans employed in India by the initiation of a long-service decoration for the Indian Army Reserve of Officers or by allowing service with the Indian Army Reserve of Officers to

'count as double for the Volunteer officers' decoration in the case of those who were either on the strength of the Volunteer Force on the 4th August, 1914, or joined it subsequently, irrespective of whether their names remained on the Volunteer rolls for the whole of their war service with the Indian Army Reserve of Officers or by allowing efficient members of Indian Volunteer corps who were actually mobilised with the Territorials in England on the 5th August, 1914, to qualify for the Territorial war medal or by initiating a Volunteer war medal for those who were actually mobilised with any unit during August, 1914, or by placing all those who served in a military capacity outside their pre-War Presidency or province on a par with members of the British Army in India for the award of the 1914-18 medal?

Mr. MONTAGU: It is not proposed to institute a special decoration for officers of the Indian Army Reserve. These officers qualify for war medals under the same conditions as regular officers of the Indian Army. Under Army Instruction (India) 723 of 21st September, 1920, embodied service in India in the case of an Indian volunteer who belonged to the Volunteer Force on the 4th August, 1914, and served continuously from that date, counts double as qualifying service for the award of the Volunteer officer's decoration and the Volunteer Long Service Medal. The restriction that such Volunteers should be serving on the 4th August, 1914, is in accordance with the decision of the General Commanding in the case of the Territorial Force. Under the same Army Instruction (India), service actually rendered by an Indian Volunteer in a theatre of war in any capacity also counts double as qualifying service for the Volunteer officer's decoration and the Volunteer Long Service Medal, provided that his name was retained on the rolls of a Volunteer unit throughout such service. I will consult the Government of India as to the possibility of this proviso being modified or withdrawn. Indian Volunteers who were mobilised with the Territorial Force in England on the 5th August, 1914, must, presumably, have belonged to the Territorial Force at the outbreak of War, and would, therefore, be eligible for the award of the Territorial Force Medal if they fulfilled the necessary conditions. If at some future date it is decided to grant a medal for home service, the question of its award,

or the award of a similar medal, to Indian Volunteers who served only in India will be considered

Friday, 18th February, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

BRITISH NORTH BORNEO COMPANY.

Sir J. D. REES asked the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies why, in Cmd. 1060, correspondence regarding allegations against the administration of the British North Borneo Company, Annexure 1 to Minute by the President, the right hon. Sir West Ridgeway, G.C.B., was not published; and whether he will now lay upon the Table that annexure with the other papers upon this subject?

Lieut.-Colonel AMERY: The annexure was omitted at the suggestion of the British North Borneo Company, but the company have no objection to its being published, and, if publication is desired by the other parties concerned in the correspondence, I shall be prepared to arrange it.

Monday, 21st February, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

PEACE TREATIES.

MESOPOTAMIA AND PALESTINE MANDATES.

36. Viscount CURZON asked the Prime Minister whether any estimate can be given of the annual cost to this country of the Mandates for Mesopotamia and Palestine, respectively?

The SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (Mr. Churchill): The responsibility for expenditure in Mesopotamia and Palestine is about to be transferred from the Departments hitherto dealing with these countries to the Colonial Office. It is clearly impossible for me to give an estimate of the annual cost involved in the acceptance of the Mandates until I have had an opportunity of scrutinising the existing esti-

mates and consulting the local authorities. I shall lose no time in doing this. The Cabinet have decided that Conferences shall be held in Egypt and Palestine in the early part of March, at which I shall meet Sir Percy Cox, General Haldane, and certain other officials connected with the administration of Mesopotamia. I shall also take the opportunity of seeing other officers and officials now concerned with British interests in the Arabian Peninsula.

I hope that a systematic and detailed review of the whole position may enable me to submit definite recommendations for action to the Cabinet, and that I shall then be placed in a position to make a full statement to the House after the Easter Adjournment. The occasion of such a statement will no doubt be the assumption by the Colonial Office of the whole of the expense thrown upon the British Exchequer in the forthcoming Estimates on account of the Middle Eastern Territories for which we have accepted Mandates, and the presentation of an Estimate such as my hon. and gallant Friend desires to the House of Commons. The setting up of a Vote of this kind, for which a particular Minister accepts responsibility, is the surest means of securing effective Parliamentary control over the heavy expenditure. The accounts of the War Office and of the Foreign Office and the Air Ministry will subsequently be credited accordingly. If the House approves generally of this method of procedure, I will ask them to permit me to reserve as far as possible any statement until I have had an opportunity of personally consulting the men on the spot.

Viscount CURZON: Does not the Leader of the House think that the answer we have just heard amounts to the same thing as giving the right hon. Gentleman a blank cheque for Mesopotamia? Does he not think that this ought to come before the House of Commons?

Mr. BONAR LAW: There is no question of a blank cheque. The work will be conducted by one Department of the Government instead of another, and I think my right hon. Friend is right in saying that there is great advantage in having one Department responsible for making Estimates.

Mr. LAMBERT: May I ask the Leader of the House whether an Estimate for the expenditure on Mesopotamia and Palestine will be submitted to the House of Commons, and that no new permanent commitments will be entered into until the House has endorsed such Estimates?

Mr. BONAR LAW: My right hon. Friend stated distinctly that an Estimate will be presented. We are at present administering the country, and, obviously, we cannot refrain from doing what is necessary until the House has passed the Estimates.

Mr. LAMBERT: I asked whether any permanent commitments—of course, day to day commitments must be liquidated—will be postponed until after the House of Commons has had opportunity of examining the proposition?

Mr. BONAR LAW: The whole tenor of my right hon. Friend's statement was to show that the object is to have a complete examination in order to avoid further commitments to expenditure until we have examined it and until the House has sanctioned it.

Sir E. CARSON: Is there any power in the Treaty for a country that has been given a mandate to give it up?

Mr. BONAR LAW: No such power is clearly stated in the Treaty, but it is obvious that if a country refused to exercise a mandate it must have some means of giving effect to its refusal.

Sir J. D. REES: Does the Government thoroughly appreciate that the more scientific and the more reforming the Mesopotamian administration is the more it will cost the British taxpayer and the more the Mesopotamians will dislike it?

Mr. BONAR LAW: That is a general statement of opinion which I cannot endorse.

Lieut. - Commander KENWORTHY: Does not the right hon. Gentleman think it a very important matter to transfer a mandate from the Foreign Office to the Colonial Office, and shall we have an opportunity of debating the whole question?

Mr. BONAR LAW: There will be the usual opportunity, but there is no question of transferring mandates to the Colonial Office or any other Department.

[Mr. Bonar Law.]

It is the Government which has the mandate.

Lieut.-Colonel MURRAY: Will it be possible to discuss this only on the Colonial Office Estimates, and as foreign policy is intimately concerned in this matter what will be the liaison between the Foreign Office and the Colonial Office? Should not it be possible also to discuss it on the Foreign Office Estimates?

Lieut. - Commander KENWORTHY: Does not the right hon. Gentleman think it contrary to the whole spirit of the mandates to put it under the administration of the Colonial Office?

Mr. BONAR LAW: I do not see any point in that remark at all. The mandate is given to a nation. What Department exercises it is for the nation to decide. There may be some point in what my hon. and gallant Friend (Lieut.-Colonel A. Murray) suggests, that the title Colonial Office is not a suitable one for the Department exercising the office. That is being considered by the Government.

Lieut.-Colonel MURRAY: May I ask the Colonial Secretary to reply on the point?

Mr. CHURCHILL: I do not think that there will be any difficulty in the matter. I am entirely in the hands of the House. I should be glad of an opportunity of discussing the matter. So far as I am concerned I will facilitate any debate that may be brought on under the regular rules of Parliamentary procedure. I do not think that there is any difficulty in discussing the matter of a single office puts down a Vote for the whole field of expenditure. At present the House is quite unable to obtain a clear idea of what is the total cost involved. I agree entirely with the hon. Member opposite in thinking that there should be one Vote showing clearly what we are paying which can be criticised and scrutinised by the House of Commons and put forward on the authority of some individual Minister who takes full responsibility for defending the policy of the Government. I should have thought that that would be a great gain.

LONDON CONFERENCE.

44. **Mr. FORREST** asked the Prime Minister whether Bulgaria has made any claim, direct or indirect, to be heard before the coming conference in London on Turkey?

Mr. BONAR LAW: The Bulgarian Government have enquired unofficially whether any matters affecting Bulgarian interests are likely to be discussed at the forthcoming conference. They have been informed that the programme of the Conference will bear only on the Treaty of Peace with Turkey.

46. **Lieut.-Commander KENWORTHY** asked the Prime Minister whether it is expected a lasting settlement can be reached at the forthcoming conference in London on the Near East if Turks and Greeks are to be invited to attend, but not representatives of the Government of Russia?

Mr. BONAR LAW: I would refer the hon. Member to the answer given by the Prime Minister on Thursday last, to which I have nothing to add.

Lieut.-Commander KENWORTHY: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the Prime Minister's answer did not reply to the question on the Paper? Can the right hon. Gentleman answer the question? Does he think there will be any firm settlement with the Near East without consulting Russia?

Mr. BONAR LAW: I hope so. At all events, we would save no time in settling the matter by accepting the suggestion.

49. **Captain TERRELL** asked the Prime Minister the estimated cost of the coming conference over Turkey in London; and how it is defrayed by the various countries represented?

The FIRST COMMISSIONER of WORKS (Sir Alfred Mond): As the composition and numbers of conference delegations and the duration of the conference are not fully known at the present time, it is not possible at this moment to estimate the cost of the forthcoming conferences. With reference to the second part of the question, I beg to refer the hon. Member to the answer which I gave on Thursday last to a similar question by the hon. Member for Thanet.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

HONG KONG (CHILD ADOPTION).

Mr. SITCH asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been drawn to a statement

made by the Attorney-General of Hong Kong in the Legislative Council in October last that the evils resulting from the traffic in girls are so great that the present law is insufficient, and to the passing by the Council of a Bill in November giving fuller powers for dealing with it; and whether, in view of this acknowledged evil and the interest which this matter has aroused here, the recent Report of the governor of Hong Kong will be published?

Mr. CHURCHILL: Yes, Sir, I have seen the Report of the Attorney-General. The Bill in question has now become law and will, I hope, strengthen the hands of the Colonial Government in the protection of women and girls. As regards the latter part of the question, if the hon. Member is referring to the Governor's Report on child adoption I would refer him to the reply given on the 9th December to a question by the hon. Member for Wellingborough (Mr. W. Smith).

IMPERIAL CONFERENCE.

Mr. A. T. DAVIES asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any arrangements have yet been made for the Imperial Conference to be held in London; and what is the nature of the subjects to be discussed?

Mr. CHURCHILL: I am not at present in a position to add anything to the reply returned to a similar question by the Prime Minister on 17th February.

Tuesday, 22nd February, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIAN ARMY OFFICERS (ADDITIONAL PENSIONS).

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India what decision has been arrived at on the subject of the additional pensions of £200 and £100 a year which it was stated in the India Office memorandum of the 3rd June, 1920, would be granted to military officers of the Indian Army on the supernumerary list who had held certain high civil appointments?

Mr. MONTAGU: I regret that I cannot yet.

Wednesday, 23rd February, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

ARMY PAY.

3. Lieut.-Colonel GUINNESS asked the Secretary of State for India whether Indian Army Order No. 868, of October, 1919, gave the expectation that the pay of certain specified services serving in India would shortly be raised; whether such increases have been retrospective from 1st July, 1919, and have taken place in the case of all these services except Royal Engineer officers serving with the sappers and miners; and whether any decision has now been arrived at in this matter?

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Montagu): Revised rates of pay for all the services mentioned in paragraph 15 of the India Army Order referred to, including Royal Engineer officers serving with sappers and miners, have been sanctioned with effect from the 1st July, 1919.

ARMY (STRENGTH).

4. Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS asked the Secretary of State for India how many Indian cavalry regiments have been disbanded; whether they were pre-War regiments; how many men have been disbanded; and what pensions are being given to them?

Mr. MONTAGU: Three Indian Cavalry Regiments were disbanded on 10th January, 1919, and the fifth additional squadrons of four Indian Cavalry Regiments were disbanded during the year 1920. None of these regiments of squadrons were pre-War units. The establishment of the above units would amount to 2,160. Men serving on ordinary engagements get on disbandment certain special concessions in the way of pension or gratuity. I am sending my hon. Friend a copy of these rules.

Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS: Will the right hon. Gentleman take great care that

[Sir W. Joynson-Hicks.]

these men do not go back to their homes and form the focus of discontent in India?

Mr. MONTAGU: I think that is a very important consideration, and I will forward my hon. Friend's suggestion to the Government of India for consideration.

Lieut.-Commander KENWORTHY: Is not the loss of these regiments compensated for by the development of flying squadrons in India, and can we not look for some further economies by aeroplanes taking the place of cavalry?

Mr. MONTAGU: In determining the post-War army in India all these facts will be taken into consideration.

Colonel Sir C. YATE: Is it not a fact that two squadrons of aeroplanes were disbanded a short time ago in India?

Mr. MONTAGU: Yes, I believe there was a reduction of two squadrons of aeroplanes.

1. **Sir J. D. REES** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he can give the House any information regarding recent or prospective reductions in the Indian Army?

6. **Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware of the anxiety caused in India by the proposal to reduce the Army below pre-War limits; whether such proposals had the approval of the Commander-in-Chief; and when the decision was arrived at?

8. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India how many regiments of cavalry and battalions of infantry are to be reduced in the Indian Army; what was the number of each in 1914; and what will be the number when the proposed reductions are carried out?

Mr. MONTAGU: There were in India and Aden in 1914: 39 Indian cavalry regiments, 132 battalions of Indian infantry and pioneers, and, in addition, 6 Indian infantry battalions in overseas garrisons. Arrangements are now being made to maintain in India: 21 Indian cavalry regiments, 132 battalions of Indian infantry and pioneers, with a somewhat reduced establishment. In addition there will remain the Indian cavalry and infantry units employed overseas. But the question of the final post-War

strength of the Army in India is engaging the close attention of His Majesty's Government, and I hope to make a statement to-day fortnight.

Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS: I hope I am not pressing the right hon. Gentleman too far, but may I have the assurance that pending the statement no further reductions shall take place?

Mr. MONTAGU: Yes. Pending that statement no further reductions are contemplated.

Lieut.-Colonel CROFT: In view of the fact that the last answer seems to contradict the answer to a previous question may I ask the right hon. Gentleman if the discrepancy in the number of cavalry regiments, between 39 and 21, is made up by cavalry regiments serving in other theatres, or is there a reduction?

Mr. MONTAGU: The previous question referred to reductions already made. This refers to reductions that are to be made.

Lieut.-Colonel CROFT: Is it a fact that there is to be a very considerable reduction in Indian cavalry regiments?

Mr. MONTAGU: Yes, there is to be a considerable reduction. I think I shall be able to explain it to the satisfaction of the hon. and gallant Member this day fortnight, when I hope to make a statement on the whole question.

Mr. GWYNNE: Will the right hon. Gentleman answer the last part of Question 6, whether such proposals had the approval of the Commander-in-Chief, and when the decision was arrived at?

Mr. MONTAGU: I think the whole position will be made quite clear when I am in a position to make a statement. No reduction has yet been sanctioned on which there has been dissension of any sort or kind in the government of India.

Sir C. YATE: How many regiments are serving abroad, and, deducting these, to what number will it actually be reduced?

Mr. MONTAGU: I should like to consult the War Office before I say how many cavalry regiments are serving abroad, for very obvious reasons. If the hon. Member will put down a question I will discuss with the War Office whether it is possible to give the information without prejudice to the public interest.

ELECTIONS (VOTERS).

5. **Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS** asked the Secretary of State for India how many voters were entitled to vote in the recent elections in each province of India and how many actually voted?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am awaiting these and other connected figures from the Government of India. As soon as they are received they will be presented to Parliament in response to a request for a return made in another place.

ARMY SERVICE (ESHER REPORT).

7. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India what steps have been taken to carry into effect the recommendations in Part V of the Esher Report in regard to the improvements in the conditions of service of the personnel of the Army in India which are so long overdue?

Mr. MONTAGU: I hope to be able to announce a decision in the matter very shortly.

Sir C. YATE: Can the right hon. Gentleman name a date?

Mr. MONTAGU: I think it will be possible to give an answer this day week.

AUXILIARY FORCE.

9. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India the number of voluntary enrolments in India up to date under the Auxiliary Force Bill, and how this number compares with the number that were enrolled under the India Defence Force Act; and what is the date fixed as the time limit for volunteering under the new Act?

Mr. MONTAGU: A report, dated the 18th January, states that "the Auxiliary Force is making good progress, and the numbers already recruited have now reached some 20,000 out of a proposed 32,000 by the end of the financial year." In October, 1920, the numbers in the Indian Defence Force were 33,451.

Sir C. YATE: Then there is a deficit now of 12,000 men?

Mr. MONTAGU: Yes, of course it will take some time to recreate a force whose number was temporarily created during the War. It is hoped that 32,000, which is approximately the number, will be recruited by 31st March.

Sir C. YATE: Is the 31st March the date fixed on which the question is to be reconsidered whether it is to be compulsory or voluntary enlistment?

Mr. MONTAGU: No date has been fixed. As soon as the Government of India say they cannot raise the force they require voluntarily, a compulsory force will have to be instituted; but at the present moment they tell me that recruiting is very satisfactory.

Sir C. YATE: Will the right hon. Gentleman fix the date on which that can be brought forward?

Mr. MONTAGU: I prefer to leave it to the Government of India, who are quite aware of what will give them the force which they require.

17. **Sir T. BENNETT** asked the Secretary of State for India the number of men who have enrolled in the force constituted under the Auxiliary Force Act of last year, giving the total enrolment for India and Burma, and the numbers recruited in Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, and other large towns, respectively; and whether the Government of India are satisfied with the result of the Act up to the present time?

Mr. MONTAGU: I would refer the hon. Member to the reply I have given the hon. and gallant Member for Melton. For the additional information regarding the numbers recruited for the Auxiliary Force in the large towns I shall have to refer to India. The Government of India state that enrolment is proceeding satisfactorily.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCILS (MINISTERS).

10. **Sir W. DAVISON** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that Mr. Har Kishan Lal, who was convicted on a charge of conspiracy to wage war and of abetting the waging of war against the King, was sentenced to transportation for life and forfeiture of property, and was subsequently pardoned as an act of clemency, has now been selected by the governor of the Punjab as one of his two Indian ministers who will be charged with the administration of public works, education, excise, commerce and industry, local government, etc.; whether in the discharge of this office he will have control over large numbers of British and Indian officials, and will exercise great patronage with wide financial powers;

[Sir W. Davison.]

whether the Secretary of State is aware of the bitter feeling which this appointment has caused among His Majesty's loyal subjects, both British and Indian; whether he has personally approved of the appointment of a recently convicted rebel to such a prominent position of trust under the Crown; and what steps he proposes to take in the matter?

14. **Captain Viscount CURZON** asked the Secretary of State for India whether Har Kishan Lal, who was committed as a rebel in the rebellion of 1919, has been appointed as a minister in the Punjab; whether since his release he has continued to take part in rebel agitation; whether in his new appointment he will have a very large number of loyal subjects of the Crown, both British and Indian, under his jurisdiction; and whether, as such an appointment is an insult to all loyalists throughout the Empire, it can be reconsidered?

Mr. MONTAGU: Under the Government of India Act, Ministers are appointed by the Governors of Governors' Provinces, hold office at the pleasure of the Governor, and are responsible to the Legislative Councils who vote their salaries. The Joint Select Committee advised that the Ministers selected by the Governors should be elected members of the Legislative Council, enjoying its confidence and capable of leading it. In these circumstances I would submit to the House that the proper place to consider the title of Ministers to the confidence of the Legislatures is the Provincial Councils.

Sir W. DAVISON: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware, and is it not a fact, that the action of the Governor is subject to the superintendence, direction, and control of the Secretary of State?

Mr. MONTAGU: No; that is not quite true. It is subject to the superintendence, direction, and control of the Secretary of State, except—I am quoting from memory—as provided in this Act, and under this Act the question of the appointment of Ministers is laid by Statute on the Governor.

Sir W. DAVISON: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that this action of showing favour to rebels is driving many loyal subjects into the hands of the extremists?

Viscount CURZON: Is it a fact, as stated in Question 14, that this man is a convicted rebel, and that he holds jurisdiction over a large number of Europeans?

Mr. SPEAKER: That does not seem to be a matter for this Parliament. It is a matter for the Legislative Council.

Viscount CURZON: Will the right hon. Gentleman exercise his influence with the Leader of the House to secure the release of the hon. Member for East Leyton (Mr. Malone)?

Sir W. DAVISON: Is it not a matter for this House to know whether a man responsible for the Government of India, who has been appointed to high office under the Crown, is a convicted rebel? I submit that we are entitled to that information.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House having given practically Home Rule, or something in the nature of Home Rule, to these Councils the less it interferes with the Councils the better.

Sir H. CRAIK: Was this nomination made by the Governor of the Punjab without any suggestion from home or from the Government of India?

Mr. MONTAGU: Of course it was. The Governor is specially charged by Statute to make his own nominations. I never knew of the appointment until some time after it was made.

Dr. MURRAY: Was not General Smuts a rebel at one time?

Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS: As your ruling, Sir, is important, may I ask if the question of law and order and India was handed over to the Councils, or were not only certain specified subjects handed over to them by this House? Is it not the case that this House retains control of every other subject other than those directly handed over?

Mr. MONTAGU: May I point out that this gentleman who has given rise to this discussion is a Minister who has charge of those very transferred subjects; and that if the Legislature does not think him a man worthy of its confidence it has its remedy, and if the Punjab does not think the Legislature worthy of its confidence it has its remedy.

Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS: I was not discussing this case. I was asking as to the things that were reserved.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is the only case that I am discussing. This is not the time to deal with hypothetical cases. What I said arose entirely out of the answer given by the Secretary of State for India.

Sir H. CRAIK: Can the system which the Government have instituted in India be described as one of Home Rule? On the contrary, is it not a system which is described by the newfangled word "diarchy," or divided rule, with common responsibility of this House and the Legislative Council?

Mr. SPEAKER: The words "Home Rule" were used, not in a technical sense, but in a general sense. Certain subjects have been transferred wholly to these Legislative Councils, and it is with regard to those only that I used the expression.

Sir W. DAVISON: As this matter is one of great importance, may I ask whether the Members of this House cannot get information from the Secretary of State for India as to certain action which may have been taken by the Governor or some of his Ministers? Are we not entitled to ask that question?

Mr. SPEAKER: It depends on the information which is asked for. When the question appears on the Paper, I will consider it.

STORES (PURCHASE).

11. **Sir T. BENNETT** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he has yet received the views of the Government of India on the Report of the Couchman Committee on the purchase of stores for the State; and whether he is now able to say how far the recommendations contained in that Report will be carried out?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have received an advance copy of the Report. Some preliminary action has been taken, but the detailed proposals of the Government of India have not yet reached me.

GOVERNMENT REPORTS.

12. **Mr. GWYNNE** asked the Secretary of State for India whether Reports, even of a trivial nature, from the Government of India to the Secretary of State are

printed; and whether this costly method of transmitting messages is necessary?

Mr. MONTAGU: If the hon. Member refers to despatches, most despatches from the Government of India are printed, because, even when the subject matter is not of the first importance, several copies are required for office use, both here and in India. The hon. Member is probably aware that the cost of printing in India is considerably less than in this country, and I doubt whether the saving effected by not printing despatches could counter-balance the inconvenience. But a very considerable mass of correspondence of a less formal character is not sent in print.

DISTURBANCES, NAIHATI.

13. **Viscount CURZON** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he can give any particulars as to the fatal riots reported at Naihati; whether they were directly due to the visit of Gandhi; and, if so, whether any action was taken against him?

Mr. MONTAGU: No riot at Naihati has been reported to me by the Government of India. I am making inquiries.

MEDICAL SERVICE.

15. **Mr. GWYNNE** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that the Indian Medical Service have received neither the benefits of the accelerated cadre promotion granted in the British Army and the Royal Army Medical Corps nor the accelerated time promotion granted in the Indian Army; whether the reason given for the exclusion of the Indian Medical Service from the British Army and Royal Army Medical Corps cadre acceleration to lieutenant-colonelcy is because the Indian Army did not have it and from the Indian Army time scale acceleration to field rank because the Royal Army Medical Corps did not have it; and what is the object of placing officers of the Indian Medical Service in this disadvantageous position?

Mr. MONTAGU: I find some difficulty in understanding the hon. Member's question. Perhaps he could furnish me with particulars of any specific case on which it is based. Meanwhile I can assure him that there has been no discrimination against the Indian Medical Service.

SHWE DAGON PAGODA.

Mr. SPOOR asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in the event of an attack by hostile ships on Rangoon, the fortification of the Shwe Dagon Pagoda would lead to its bombardment and possible destruction; and whether, since it is revered by Burmans as Westminster Abbey is by Englishmen, he will cancel the power of entry by the military in the grant of the Pagoda lands and direct that, in the case of war, these lands be used for hospital purposes only.

Mr. MONTAGU: I would refer my hon. Friend to the answer I gave to the hon. Member for Wentworth on 3rd November. A committee is now assembling at Rangoon to work out details for evacuation of the arsenal and its location elsewhere.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

IMPERIAL POLICE (MEMORIALS).

Sir W. DAVISON asked the Secretary of State for India whether he has received the memorials of Indian (Imperial) Police which were addressed to the Viceroy, and prayed for the redress of grievances, particularly in the matter of pay; whether he has also received reports from the local governments thereon, with the recommendations of the Government of India; and when such reports were received and what action has been taken in the matter?

Mr. MONTAGU: I received on 18th January a set of the memorials to which I understand my hon. Friend to refer, and on 25th January reports from most of the local governments thereon. I have not yet received the recommendations of the Government of India, but they are expected very shortly, and as soon as they reach the India Office will receive my careful consideration in Council.

NON-CO-OPERATION SCHEME.

Sir J. D. REES asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Non-Brahmin Federation of Madras Presidency passed a resolution last month

condemning the non-co-operation scheme of Mr. Gandhi and the Indian National Congress as calculated to subvert all constitutional agitation and to bring the country to chaos and anarchy, and calling on all patriotic Indians to oppose it; and whether six associations, representing the depressed classes in the Bombay presidency, have addressed the hon. Members for Newcastle-under-Lyme (Colonel Wedgwood) and Bishop Auckland (Mr. Spoor), travelling in India, urging that non-co-operation aims at the destruction of constituted authority and the withdrawal of British rule, to which the progress of the lower classes is entirely due?

Mr. MONTAGU: Yes, Sir. I understand that the facts are as stated.

MOTOR AMBULANCES (GOVERNMENT CONTRACT).

Mr. R. YOUNG asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that a contract for motor ambulances has been given to an Italian firm by or for a Government Department; what is the number of such motor ambulances; and what were the reasons why this work was given to a foreign firm when so many firms in this country could do the work, and thus employ many workpeople now unemployed?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am informed by the High Commissioner for India that 115 Fiat chassis for ambulances have been ordered for India. The Government of India required immediate supply. The Fiat chassis were surplus stocks of the Italian Government, and British firms would have required months to deliver. I may add that British firms are now constructing sample vehicles of similar type to the Fiat to be sent to India for trial.

EXCHANGE.

Mr. SUGDEN asked the Lord Privy Seal if he will make a statement on the question of stabilising the price of the rupee, and thus to assure Indian traders as to the need for at once again commencing trade relationships with this country in volumes?

Mr. MONTAGU: I would refer my hon. Friend to the replies I gave to my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for North Kensington (Lieut.-Colonel Burgoyne) on 13th December. The Indian trade posi-

tion continues in an abnormal state, and the twelve months ending December last exhibited an adverse balance against India in respect of merchandise and treasure of Rs.43 crores, as compared with the favourable balance of Rs.125 crores in 1919. I need hardly say that this situation is being anxiously watched by the Government; but I do not see at present that it is practicable for me, having regard to the extent of my sterling resources and obligations, to intervene with effect in support of the Indian exchange. While I fully appreciate the drawbacks of the present position, the causes are world wide, and beyond the control of individual Governments, and my hon. Friend is no doubt aware that there is similar instability in the sterling, franc, and other exchanges. It is my hope that traders and bankers will find means to overcome or minimise the present obstacles, which are, of course, part of the legacy of the War.

Thursday, 24th February, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

RIOTS, PUNJAB.

Colonel Sir C. YATE (*by Private Notice*) asked the Secretary of State for India if he has any information to give the House regarding the disturbance at Mankana, in which the number of killed are said to be about 200, and what was the cause of it?

Lieut.-Colonel Sir R. SANDERS (Lord of the Treasury): My right hon. Friend received the following telegram from the Government of India on Tuesday:

"Following telegram received from Government of Punjab, dated 20th February. Serious fight has taken place at Nankana in Sheikhpura district between Mahants party and Sikh reformers. Large numbers believed wounded, and one corpse reported burnt. Deputy Commissioner has cabled for military assistance, and 100 British and 100 Indian troops leave Lahore this afternoon accompanied by Commissioner."

I may explain that a Mahant is the person in charge of a temple or religious property, and that previous to this occurrence (as to which no further details have so far been received) the Govern-

ment of India reported that there had been trouble recently in several places in the Punjab connected with Sikh shrines, and that, in consequence, the Punjab Government has decided to move its legislative council to appoint a committee of inquiry with a view to legislation.

INDIAN ADMINISTRATION (QUESTIONS).

Viscount CURZON: I desire to ask you, Sir, a question with regard to the ruling given yesterday on a question in reference to India. I asked a question with reference to a certain man in India, and whether certain statements made about him were correct. You replied that it did not seem to be a matter for Parliament, but one for the Legislative Council. The hon. Member for South Kensington (Sir W. Davison) then asked:

Is it not a matter for this House to know whether a man responsible for the Government of India, who has been appointed to high office under the Crown, is a convicted rebel? I submit that we are entitled to that information.

You said that the House having practically given the Home Rule, or something in the nature of Home Rule, to these councils, the less it interfered with the councils the better. When a country has been given Home Rule, are we to understand that no further questions may be asked about the details of administration in that country?

Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS: May I call your attention to a section of the Act passed the year before last? Section 4 enacts that the Governor of a Governor's Province may, by notification, appoint ministers, not being members of his Executive, and so on. The Governor of this Province was an officer appointed by the Crown, and for the appointment of that officer the Secretary of State is clearly responsible. I submit that under the terms of that section, this minister having been appointed by the Governor of the Province, who was appointed by the Secretary of State here, we are entitled to ask questions of the Secretary of State as to the conduct of his own appointment.

Mr. ORMSBY-GORE: Is it not also laid down that the Ministers so appointed are responsible to the Local

[Mr. Ormsby-Gore.]

Legislature and removable by the Provincial Council. If that be so, would not a deadlock be reached at once if Ministers were appointed to an Indian Province and had not the confidence of the Provincial Assembly of that province. Therefore, is it not impossible for two Legislative Chambers to attempt to share such responsibility, and will it not have to be made quite clear whether the Indian Ministers are responsible to the Provincial Councils or to this House. It must be one or the other; both cannot possibly exercise the responsibility.

Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS: My hon. Friend has not quoted the Section, which goes on to say:

"Any Ministers so appointed shall hold office during his (the Governor's) pleasure."

Sir H. CRAIK: Might I, as a member of the Joint Committee, point out that the nomination of these Ministers is in the hands of the Governor, but we were repeatedly assured that the Governor would be responsible to the Secretary of State. That is quite independent of the methods that may be used by the Assembly for removing such Ministers. The original appointment of the Ministers is in the hands of the Governor, and the Governor is responsible to the Secretary of State, who is answerable to this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Noble Lord asked me a general question, and I pray in aid, in reply, the legal phrase, "*Dolus latet in generalibus*." I will not answer it in general terms. I will only say that it must depend in each case upon the events into which it is desired to inquire, and upon the questions which are put. We are now commencing a new era in India, and it appeared to me yesterday, and still appears so to me to-day, that it would be extremely undesirable if this House were to attempt to undertake the function of controlling or criticising the Ministers who are responsible to the newly created legislative bodies. After all, the Ministers, however chosen, however selected, are the Ministers of those legislative bodies, they presumably have their confidence, their salaries are voted by them. Talk of dyarchy! It would indeed be dyarchy if we supervised those Ministers as well as the legislative councils to whom they are responsible. For that reason I think that we had far

better begin by abstaining from asking questions and criticising the Ministers who have been duly selected by the Governor, under the Statutory Powers which this House has given him for that purpose.

Sir H. CRAIK: On the point of Order. May I say, with great respect, that the question raised was not in regard to any criticism of the action of the Minister, who is now responsible to the Assembly in India. A question was raised with regard to the action of the Governor, who is subject to the Secretary of State. The question had relation, not to the action of the Minister, but solely to the action of the Governor in appointing the Minister; and we contend that the Governor, in so doing, was responsible to the Secretary of State, and, through him, to this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question was intended to hit the Minister through the body of the Governor.

Sir W. DAVISON: My question was, was it a fact that the Governor had appointed to a Ministry in the Punjab a gentleman who had been convicted of rebellion against the Crown; and, as the Governor was appointed on the recommendation of the Prime Minister, I thought that that was a question which might be asked in this House.

Viscount CURZON: The question that I asked the Minister was, was it a fact, as stated, that this man was a convicted rebel, and that he held jurisdiction over a large number of Europeans? The statement appeared in the Press that he was a convicted rebel, and I wanted to know for information, whether it was so or not. To that you replied that it did not seem to be a matter for this Parliament. May I now ask whether I was entitled to have the information for which I asked, without any reference to criticising the action of anyone?

Mr. SPEAKER: If you say that a man is a convicted rebel, I think you criticise him. You do not do him any good.

Mr. DEVLIN: Do I understand that a rebel is entitled to be a Minister if he is not convicted?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is leading me into deep waters.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

IMPORTS (UNCLEARED GOODS).

Mr. CLOUGH asked the Secretary of State for India what is happening to the vast amount of goods imported into India, but meeting with the refusal of the native dealers to accept delivery, even under contract, in view of the depreciation of the rupee; whether there is adequate godown and warehouse accommodation at Bombay and Calcutta; and, if not, whether to avoid unnecessary loss to British manufacturers and merchants he can, if desirable, place at the disposal of importers a certain amount of space in unused Government buildings as a purely temporary measure?

Mr. MONTAGU: Considerable quantities of uncleared goods have, I understand, accumulated at the ports, but I have no information that warehouse accommodation is inadequate. I shall, however, communicate my hon. Friend's suggestion to the Government of India.

WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY.

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India what progress has been made in the development of wireless telegraphy in India?

Mr. MONTAGU: Eighteen wireless stations are available for general public correspondence in India and with ships in the waters adjacent thereto. These stations are owned and managed by the Indian Telegraph Department and are under the special charge of a Director of Wireless Telegraphy who is responsible to the Director-General of Posts and Telegraphs. I understand that the Director-General has submitted to the Government of India a scheme containing a five years' programme for the general improvement of internal wireless communication in India. For purposes of external communication, especially with this country, a station in India will be included in the Imperial Wireless Chain, the construction of which is now under consideration.

ARMS ACT.

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India if he has any information to show that the dissatisfaction expressed

by British residents in India regarding the administration of the rules framed under the Indian Arms Act has now been allayed; and, if not, will he call for a Report from the Government of India on the subject?

Mr. MONTAGU: The Government of India sent a full statement to the European Association, in which certain misunderstandings were set right. I have not been informed how far this has allayed the dissatisfaction previously expressed, but I will inquire.

Friday, 25th February, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

BRITISH TROOPS (INDIA).

Major-General Sir J. DAVIDSON asked the Secretary of State for India what was the number of British battalions and cavalry regiments stationed in India before the War; and what is the present number?

Mr. MONTAGU: *Before the War*—9 British Cavalry Regiments; 51 British Infantry Battalions. *Now*—8 British Cavalry Regiments; 45 British Infantry Battalions. There are, in addition, to be 5 Companies of Armoured Cars.

Monday, 28th February, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

PREROGATIVE OF MERCY.

52. Sir W. DAVISON asked the Prime Minister whether he will see that in the warrant of appointment to the new Viceroy of India the power of pardon in the case of political offences is reserved to His Majesty the King on the advice of the Secretary of State for India, in accordance with the old practice, so that assurances given to the House in these matters by the Secretary of State for India may not be nullified by the action of the Viceroy without consultation with or approval by the Imperial Government as was recently the case?

The PRIME MINISTER: The exercise of the prerogative has been vested in the Governor-General of India, on behalf of His Majesty, since 1914, to enable pardons to be granted in India by His Majesty's representative on the spot, and I see no reason for making any change. His Majesty's Government has every confidence in the use of his discretion by the Governor-General.

Sir W. DAVISON: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the Secretary of State for India in July last gave an assurance that an amnesty would be granted to certain political offenders in India, but that they would not be pardoned, and that recently the Viceroy pardoned these offenders, thus enabling them to sit on the new Councils? Was that done without the knowledge and the approval of the Secretary of State? Is that not undesirable, seeing that the Imperial Parliament is responsible for law and order?

Sir H. BRITAIN: Are we not sending out to India a Viceroy with a great deal more knowledge of law than the Secretary of State?

SECRETARY OF STATE (POWERS).

53. **Sir W. DAVISON** asked the Prime Minister whether he will appoint a Select Committee to inquire into and report as to the present position of the Secretary of State for India in relation to Parliament, having regard to the changes effected by the Government of India Act, and in particular as to his powers of superintendence, direction, and control over the action of States Governors?

The PRIME MINISTER: The Government do not consider that the adoption of the suggestion of my hon. Friend is necessary or desirable.

Sir W. DAVISON: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the House was unable last week to obtain any information from the Secretary of State for India as to certain actions of one of the State Governors, and is he aware that the Government of India Act specially says that whereas the action of Parliament in such matters—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman must give notice of that question.

Tuesday, March 1st, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIAN ADMINISTRATION (QUESTIONS).

Sir H. CRAIK: I desire with your permission, Mr. Speaker, to raise a point of Order arising out of certain rulings which you gave on Wednesday and Thursday last, which rulings have given rise to anxiety in many quarters. That is due to an interpretation being placed upon them which I think they were not intended to bear. The point arose on Wednesday with reference to a question as to the action of a Governor in appointing a certain Minister, and you said, Sir,

"That does not seem to be a matter for this Parliament."

You further stated:

"The House having given practically Home Rule or something in the nature of Home Rule to these Councils, the less it interferes with these Councils the better."
—[OFFICIAL REPORT, Wednesday, 23rd February, 1921, col. 901, Vol. 138.]

On Thursday in reply to a question of my own as to the responsibility of the Governor to this House through the Secretary of State, quite irrespective of any question of the Minister or the Council, you stated:

"The question was intended to hit the Minister through the body of the Governor."
—[OFFICIAL REPORT, Thursday, 24th February, 1921, col. 1149, Vol. 138.]

I desire to raise now no question in regard to the Minister or the Local Council, nor, so far as I understood, was either of these involved in the question of the responsibility of the Governor to this House through the Secretary of State for India. I venture to call your attention to the Preamble of the Act of 1919, wherein, in reference to the progressive realisation of responsible government in British India, it is stated:

"Progress in giving effect to this policy can only be achieved by successive stages,"
and further:

"The time and manner of each advance can be determined only by Parliament upon whom the responsibility lies for the welfare and advancement of the Indian peoples."

I would further call your attention to the fact that the appointment of the

Minister rests solely with the Governor, and that under the Act and in accordance with strong recommendation from the Joint Committee responsibility to this House through the Secretary of State is strongly affirmed, and any rules restricting such responsibility must be approved by Parliament under Section 33 of the Act. I desire therefore to ask you whether we are right in assuming that nothing in your rulings of last week should be understood as limiting the powers of Parliament to supervise the action of officers acting in India under the Secretary of State, or the right of Members of this House to raise questions as to such action.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the right hon. Gentleman for having been kind enough to postpone from yesterday to to-day the raising of this point of Order. That has given me more time to look into the matter and refresh my memory by reading again the Preamble to the Act of 1919. The more I look at it the more I am convinced that I was right. The last paragraph says:

“And whereas concurrently with the gradual development of self-governing institutions in the Provinces of India it is expedient to give to those Provinces in provincial matters the largest measure of independence of the Government of India which is compatible with the due discharge by the latter of its own responsibilities.”

If, therefore, this House was of opinion that it was desirable to give the Provinces of India the largest possible measure of independence of the Government of India *a fortiori*, it is desirable that those Provinces should be given a large measure of independence of the Imperial Parliament. That was my reading and that is my reasoning upon the Preamble. I have also looked at the Act again. I have come to the conclusion that, having started upon this new departure of granting a measure of self-government to the Provinces of India, it is highly undesirable that this House should interfere in any way with the control by those provincial Legislatures of their own affairs. The Ministers who are selected by the Provincial Governors are selected under the Act of Parliament by the Governors, but the Ministers are responsible to the Legislative Councils of those Provinces, and even if this House were to pass some censure, either direct or indirect, upon such a Minister, it would be futile.

Therefore, it is very undesirable that it should be done or that any step should be taken which would lead up to it.

It seems, therefore, to me that, taking the broad view of the situation, Parliament intended to transfer to these Provinces of India complete control, subject, possibly, to the action of the Indian Legislature, of the transferred subjects and of the transferred subjects only—those are the only ones I am referring to. For that purpose the Governors of Provinces are empowered to select Ministers who will be responsible to the Provincial Legislative Council. Therefore, to permit criticism of the character or conduct of the Governors in the matter of transferred subjects appears to me to nullify the intentions of the Act. I have also come to the following conclusion. If it is desired to condemn the action of any Governor in a matter not transferred, it is open to a Member to make a Motion of a character similar to that which is made in the case of the Governor-General of India or the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. That, I think, replies to the last part of the hon. Member's point of Order as to the power of this House to supervise the action of the officers acting under the Secretary of State.

SIR H. CRAIK: With all respect to your ruling, may I point out that I intended, and I thought I had conveyed my meaning, to confine my point solely to the question not of the case of Ministers dealing with transferred subjects but of the action of the officers responsible through the Secretary of State to this House in their general administrative acts. I was not referring to the transferred subjects at all. The appointment of those ministers is not a transferred subject. It is a matter for which the Governors are responsible, as I understand, to this House, but I gather from the last words that fell from you that you leave to Members the right to raise questions as to the action of such officers?

MR. SPEAKER: That is so. I accept the view of the right hon. Gentleman, but upon the question of transferred subjects I still hold that there is no right of interference by this House.

LORD HUGH CECIL: Of course we recognise that it is for the Chair to determine questions of Order, but I do not

[Lord H. Cecil.]
quite understand how this is a question of Order. It may or may not be desirable to interfere with transferred subjects, but it is for the House to consider the question; it is not a matter for the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Noble Lord, I think, was not here when questions were put last week which raised the point of Order. That is why I was brought in.

Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS: May I ask, in view of the judgment which you have now delivered, that the action of the Governor may be criticised whether an appointment by a Governor of A or B is not an act coming directly under your ruling, seeing that the Governor is responsible to the Secretary of State for his action? We do not want to ask the views of yourself or of any other Members as to the acts of individual Ministers, but may we not, under your ruling, ask whether a Governor has appointed A or B as a Minister?

Mr. SPEAKER: I thought that I had answered that question. As a result of my construction of the Act, it places him in the same position as the Governor-General. If criticism be desired, a Motion should be put down in the ordinary way, and discussed in this House.

Sir J. D. REES: Will not the difficulties of the Indian Governors, which are already sufficient, be immensely increased if the House is to discuss and criticise their appointments of Ministers?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am much obliged to the hon. Baronet for his support.

Mr. RONALD McNEILL: Are not the restrictions and rules with regard to the putting of questions in this House definitely laid down in the Manual of Procedure which is in the hands of all Members, and would it not be more desirable that the Standing Orders on which those rules are based should be altered to meet these growing requirements than that the existing rules should be extended, however desirable it may be, by the exercise and discretion of the Chair? It would give much more certain guidance to hon. Members, and, in view of the growing importance of the relations between the Imperial Parliament and subordinate Parliaments, this is a matter which may come up in the future in many respects.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are no Standing Orders applicable to the present case, but there is no reason, if the House think fit, why it should not introduce such a Standing Order as the hon. Gentleman suggests.

Mr. ORMSBY-GORE: Is it correct to use the words "subordinate Parliaments" for the Legislatures of Canada and the Commonwealth of Australia? Is not that one of the things most resented in the Commonwealth, and is it not much more desirable, if we are going to frame a new Standing Order dealing with the powers of this House to question all these various Legislatures of the Empire, that the word "subordinate" should be carefully kept out in each case?

Lieut.-Colonel ARCHER-SHEE: Is it not the fact that India is a self-governing Dominion?

Mr. SPEAKER: We are getting rather far from the point from which we started.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

HOUSE ACCOMMODATION (ARMY OFFICERS).

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India what steps have been taken to remedy the housing difficulty in cantonments in India and to reduce the excessive rents that officers have hitherto been compelled to pay?

Mr. MONTAGU: In order to mitigate to some extent the difficulty of the shortage of house accommodation the Government of India propose to build hostels containing accommodation for about 12 married and 22 single officers at certain stations where accommodation is most inadequate, beginning with Lahore and Rawalpindi. The rate of progress must depend on the financial situation. The Government of India are also purchasing suitable houses in cantonments as they come on the market. The rent charged for quarters so provided is limited to a maximum of 10 per cent. of the officer's salary.

KING'S CADETSHIPS.

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India out of the 35 Indian Army

appointments offered at the last examination for Sandhurst in November, 1920, how many of the successful candidates put down their names for the Indian Army and how many of these were King's India cadets?

Mr. MONTAGU: The examination to which my hon. and gallant Friend refers was one for admission to the Royal Military College, and although the number of Indian Army appointments is announced at the time of the entrance examination, it is not until cadets are in their last term that they are called upon to state whether they wish to enter the Indian Army or a British regiment. This applies to ordinary cadets as well as to King's India cadets, but I have recently decided that future nominations to King's India cadetships shall be conditional on the candidates expressing their intention of entering the Indian Army.

ESHER REPORT (RECOMMENDATIONS).

Sir J. DAVIDSON asked the Secretary of State for India whether it is the intention of the Government to give effect to the Esher Committee's recommendations in regard to the amelioration of the lot of the British Army in India; and, if so, when these recommendations will come into effect?

Mr. MONTAGU: As I stated in reply to my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Melton (Sir C. Yale) on the 23rd February, I hope to be able to announce a decision shortly.

Wednesday, 2nd March, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS (COST OF PASSAGES).

1. **Colonel Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India what has been the result of his communication with the Government of India with regard to the cheapening of the cost of passages for Government officials to and from India?

The **SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Montagu):** The question is still under consideration in India. A telegram was sent last week to the Government of India, asking what stage the inquiry had reached. I await their final answer.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCILS (ELECTIONS).

2. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the number of bogus candidates who have been put forward at the recent elections in India, he will now consult the Government of India as to the advisability of requiring a deposit for each candidate for election to the imperial and provincial legislative councils, to be returned if the candidate secures a prescribed number of votes, but otherwise to be forfeited, the same as in the United Kingdom, and also as provided for in the new Constitution for Malta?

Mr. MONTAGU: I will communicate my hon. and gallant Friend's question to the Government of India, who will no doubt review their original decision in the light of the experience since gained.

RUPEE EXCHANGE.

4. **Mr. CLOUGH** asked the Secretary of State for India if he can make any statement on the extent to which native traders are refusing to meet British liabilities at any rate of exchange except 10 rupees to the £; and whether the Government is taking any action or can take any action to relieve the existing tension arising therefrom in commercial circles?

Mr. MONTAGU: I understand that most of the important Indian piece goods associations have passed resolutions against the payment of drafts under a two-shilling rate of exchange. The Government of India have informed me that they do not consider that they can usefully intervene in the matter. At a meeting of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of India and Ceylon held last January the finance member of the Government of India strongly criticised the policy of refusal to meet contractual obligations, and I need hardly say that I entirely share his view of the position.

GOVERNMENT MOTOR VEHICLES.

7. **Mr. MANVILLE** asked the Secretary of State for India whether an order for

[Mr. Manville.]

motor car chassis required by the Government of India has been placed in Italy; and, if so, will he state the number of the chassis so ordered and their value?

Mr. MONTAGU: Orders for 144 motor vehicles of various kinds have been placed in Italy on behalf of the Government of India at a total cost of approximately £70,000.

Mr. MANVILLE: Does the right hon. Gentleman really think that in times such as these the Government of India ought to have ordered material of that sort from Italy, seeing what the position of the motor car industry is in this country?

Sir FORTESCUE FLANNERY: Is it the policy of the Government of India to buy cheaply or to assist in the employment of British workers?

Mr. MONTAGU: The Government of India have to have regard to the interests of the Indian taxpayers. They would naturally prefer to buy here rather than abroad. The circumstances connected with this particular purchase, which I understand were ambulance cars, were that there was ready a surplus stock belonging to the Italian Government, and they were required to meet an urgent demand. British firms are going to tender for the remainder of the supply.

Captain Viscount CURZON: Can the right hon. Gentleman say whether these chassis were new ones or cars which had been used during the War?

Mr. MONTAGU: I understand that they were surplus stock belonging to the Italian Government, as far as the majority of the cars are concerned. I am not sure whether they were new or had been used during the War, but if my Noble Friend will put another question I will ascertain.

8. **Mr. MANVILLE** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that British manufacturers are preparing special designs for motor vehicles at the request of the India Office and submitting vehicles for trial in April; and will he, under these circumstances, see that the requirements of the India Office for motor transport in India are satisfied through British manufacturers?

Mr. MONTAGU: Sample motor vehicles are being prepared by British manufacturers for trial in India. Provided that these samples prove to be satisfactory after trial, the High Commissioner will give the British manufacturers full opportunities of tendering for any supplies that may be required, and will give every attention to such tenders.

PUNJAB DISTURBANCES.

9. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India what steps have been taken by the Government of India to secure the safety and interests of the officials and non-officials in India who either prepared the cases or gave evidence against men who were convicted of conspiring and abetting the waging of war against the King in the late rebellion in the Punjab or who have manifested their loyalty in other ways, and who now, as stated in the Press, are being insulted, defamed, and attacked simply because they have a record of loyal service during the War?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have seen the letter to which the hon. and gallant Baronet refers. I am addressing inquiries to the Government of India on the subject; meanwhile I am placing in the Library a list of those in the Punjab and Delhi whom the Government has rewarded or thanked for good services during the disturbances. The list, it will be seen, contains over 1,400 names.

TEA (EXPORT DUTY).

11. **Sir J. D. REES** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that the export duty on tea presses heavily upon an industry exposed at present to many adverse influences; and whether, in view of the comparatively satisfactory condition of Indian finances, the Government of India will abolish this novel additional impost?

Mr. MONTAGU: My hon. Friend will have seen that the Government of India have found themselves under the necessity of raising additional revenue amounting to 19 crores in the coming financial year. In the circumstances it is not surprising that they have not seen their way to proposing any remissions of taxation.

ARMY (ESHER REPORT).

12. **Sir J. D. REES** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is in a position to give the House any information regarding action taken, or to be taken, upon the Esher Report?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am not yet in a position to announce any conclusions on the recommendations of the Esher Committee, except on certain proposals in Part V., regarding which I hope to make an announcement shortly, as I stated in reply to my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Melton on the 23rd February.

Sir J. D. REES: Is the position altered by the resolution passed in the Legislative Assembly of India as regards the Esher Report? Does that resolution alter the position as regards the action to be taken upon it?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am not sure to which resolution my hon. Friend refers.

BURMA REFORM BILL.

13. **Sir J. D. REES** asked the Secretary of State for India what decision has been taken as regards the Burma Bill.

6. **Mr. ORMSBY-GORE** asked the Secretary of State for India when the Burma Reform Bill will be introduced; and whether he will give sufficient interval between the introduction of the Bill and its reference to the Standing Joint Committee of both Houses of Parliament to enable the opinions of the various persons interested to be made public?

16. **Mr. MILLS** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is now able to state on what date he expects to introduce the Burma Reforms Bill.

Mr. MONTAGU: I hope it will be introduced in another place this week.

Sir J. D. REES: Will it be referred to a Select Committee?

Mr. MONTAGU: I think so.

CIVIL SERVICE.

14. **Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS** asked the Secretary of State for India whether

the Report of the Joint Select Committee on the Government of India Bill, Clause 36, expressed the definite opinion that in the case of members of the Indian services who felt that they could not usefully take part in the new reform schemes they should be offered an equivalent career elsewhere, or that they should be allowed to retire on proportionate pensions; whether, in consequence of this recommendation, members of the Indian Civil Service memorialised the Secretary of State with a view to securing such pensions; whether the Secretary of State, in his despatch to the Viceroy of October, 1920, stated that he would not consent to a scale of pensions which it would be open to any member of the service to claim as a matter of right on a mere statement that he found himself unable to serve under the new conditions; upon what grounds he has overridden the decision of the Joint Select Committee; and what is the present position with regard to members of the Indian Civil Service who desire to retire on proportionate pensions?

Mr. MONTAGU: The despatch to which my hon. Friend refers does not in any way override the recommendation of the Joint Select Committee, which can be adopted without devising a scale of pension. I can assure the House that any case of the kind which comes before the Secretary of State in Council will be dealt with in strict accord with the recommendation of the Joint Select Committee and the pledges that I have given to the House.

15. **Dr. McDONALD** asked the Secretary of State for India if he will take into consideration the hardship of many old well-trying Indian Civil servants who retired prior to 1913, and have not, therefore, benefited by the increased pension; and will he take steps to place these pensioners on an equal footing with their younger brethren, especially recognising the fact that their increasing years is a bar to other remunerative employment?

Mr. MONTAGU: I would refer the hon. Member to the answer given by my right hon. Friend the President of the Board of Education on my behalf to a question by the hon. and gallant Member for Melton on the 28th October last. I will send the hon. Member a copy.

PROVINCIAL AND LEGISLATIVE COUNCILS.

17. **Sir WILLIAM DAVISON** asked the Secretary of State for India whether in the instructions issued to the governors of Indian provinces or presidencies they are directed to safeguard all members of His Majesty's services in the legitimate exercise of their functions and in the enjoyment of all recognised rights and privileges, and to see that no order of the Local Provincial Council or of the Local Legislative Council shall be so framed that any of the diverse interests of, or arising from, race, religion, education, social condition, wealth, or any other circumstance may receive unfair advantage, or may unfairly be deprived of privileges or advantages which they have heretofore enjoyed; and whether he is responsible to Parliament to see that governors of provinces act in accordance with his instructions?

Mr. MONTAGU: The hon. Member has correctly quoted parts of certain passages in the instructions issued over the Royal Sign Manual to the governors of "Governors' provinces." The answer to the last part of this question is in the affirmative.

18. **Sir W. DAVISON** asked the Secretary of State for India whether, seeing that in the preamble of the Government of India Act it is expressly stated that the Imperial Parliament, in considering the gradual development of self-governing institutions in India, must be guided by the co-operation received from those in whom new opportunities of service will be conferred and by the extent to which it is found that confidence can be reposed in their sense of responsibility, he will inform the House whether Members of Parliament will be able to ascertain from the Secretary of State from time to time as to the manner in which the various provincial councils are dealing with matters committed to them so that Parliament may be guided as to its future action regarding the conferring of further responsibilities on such provincial councils?

Mr. MONTAGU: I would refer the hon. Member to the provisions in Section 84A of the amended Government of India Act for the appointment of the first Statutory Commission for the very purpose which he has in view. Parliament is, of course,

fully entitled to seek information, but I trust it will not seek to intervene in matters specifically entrusted to Indian legislatures.

Sir W. DAVISON: I understand that this Parliament can ascertain facts which occur in these legislatures or with regard to the action of the governors without interfering with what actually takes place?

Mr. MONTAGU: I always desire to place at the disposal of the House any information of this kind.

Viscount CURZON: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that I was requested to take a question off the Paper to-day which related solely to a question of fact and nothing else?

DR. A. D. DENNING.

19. **Mr. THOMAS GRIFFITHS** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that Dr. A. D. Denning, of Stafford, entered into a contract with the Indian Government for five years' service in India; that at the end of three years the contract was terminated on medical grounds which were afterwards found to be erroneous; that subsequently it was claimed and upheld that, despite any contract, the services of a servant could be terminated at the will and pleasure of the Crown; that the India Office has since granted Dr. Denning £500, which is not sufficient to cover his costs in the legal action; and that consequently Dr. Denning is without compensation for the loss of his appointment; whether this case will have further consideration; and whether, in order that men of ability may be encouraged to enter into these contracts, he will consider the advisability of abandoning the claim that service can be terminated at the will and pleasure of the Crown?

Mr. MONTAGU: The facts referred to in the first two parts of the question are generally as stated except that the medical grounds on which Dr. Denning's contract was terminated were not found to be erroneous. As regards the third part of the question, Dr. Denning subsequently brought an action for breach of contract or, in the alternative, for wrongful dismissal; the Secretary of State for

India in Council contended that Dr. Denning's service was terminated in accordance with his agreement by which he undertook to obey the rules prescribed for his branch of the public service; these rules provide for the termination of an officer's duty on grounds of ill-health; but the case was settled on a preliminary point of law that no action can lie against the Crown for the termination of such service at the pleasure of the Crown; in view of certain comments made by Mr. Justice Bailhache on the form of the agreement (an old form which was altered some years ago) Dr. Denning was granted by the Secretary of State for India in Council £500 on account of his costs; I am not aware that this sum is insufficient for the purpose, nor that he has any claim, on the merits, to compensation for the loss of his appointment. I do not think that this particular case calls for further consideration. As regards the last part of the question, I am advised that it would be improper to introduce in the contracts referred to any words purporting to limit the right of the Crown to dispense with the services of its officers, but this right would naturally be used, if at all, in very exceptional circumstances.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that under our commercial institutions and industrial arrangements employers and workmen get equality so far as notice is concerned, and why are these civil servants to be treated in a different way from the industrial workers and employers in this country?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am not familiar with private employment. Of course, analogies are always very dangerous things, and I should have to consider the exact application of the analogy which the hon. Member desires to make.

Mr. ORMSY-GORE: Will the right hon. Gentleman take into account the fact that Dr. Denning, by the action of the Government of India, has suffered very severely in prospects, and although £500 may go some way towards compensating him there are other considerations in his case which ought to be continually in the mind of the Government with a view to reinstating this man in something like the position he had before he took service under the Government of Bengal. Will

the right hon. Gentleman look once again into these contracts and see if some Clause cannot be inserted safeguarding the interests of persons who take service in this way?

Mr. MONTAGU: The form of contract has been altered since Dr. Denning signed with a view to obviating some of the difficulties. I would point out that the Council of India, in regard to Dr. Denning, have acted within the law in recognition of the difficulties of his position.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: If the contract has been altered, has it been to the advantage of the civil servants?

Mr. MONTAGU: I will send my hon. Friend a copy of the new form of contract and the old one, and then the hon. Member can see for himself. I think the new form makes the position quite clear.

RAILWAY OFFICERS (WAR SERVICE).

20. **Mr. RENDALL** asked the Secretary of State for India whether certain officers of the Indian State railways when the War broke out were given 20 months' work at Army Headquarters, Q Branch, India, then detailed for active service with the Mesopotamia Expeditionary Force; in 1916 were placed on recruiting duty for Mesopotamia railways, and embarked for Basrah July, 1916, and served with the Mesopotamia Expeditionary Force till 14th July, 1920; whether during the whole period such officers wore military officers' uniforms with badges of rank and were subject to military law; why they were given only relative rank and no commission and were debarred from holding their Indian volunteer commission, which lapsed from date of embarkation, although other railway officers in France and East Africa and other departmental officers, such as posts and telegraphs, were in Mesopotamia granted commissions; whether these officers have constantly made representations as to the unfair way they have been treated; and why, if officers of the Postal Department in Mesopotamia were granted commissions at an advanced date, the same course cannot be taken with railway officers, especially those who held volunteer commissioned rank in India?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have no information on the subject, but will inquire of the Government of India.

Mr. RENDALL: When is the right hon. Gentleman likely to get the information which will enable him to answer this question?

Mr. MONTAGU: It is very difficult to get the information. I will see if I can obtain it by telegraph.

IMPORT DUTIES.

Sir J. RANGLES (*by Private Notice*) asked the Secretary of State for India is it a fact that increased duties on imports to India are imposed from to-day, following the new India Budget; and are any steps being taken or likely to be taken by which Empire goods will receive preferential treatment in India?

Mr. MONTAGU: Increased duties were imposed as from yesterday. Simultaneously an announcement has with my approval been made in India that a Commission will be appointed to examine, with reference to all the interests concerned, into the future fiscal policy of the Government of India, including the desirability of adopting the principle of Imperial Preference. The House will realise that no decision regarding Imperial Preference can be taken until the Commission reports.

Sir W. JOHNSON-HICKS: Can we have an assurance from my right hon. Friend that he will be a whole-hearted supporter of Imperial Preference?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am very anxious that in any fiscal arrangement devised for the Empire, India will take her place as a free partner in the British Empire following the general Imperial practice

amounts of Council drafts and reverse drafts sold during 1918-20 were as follows. The figures are given to the nearest crore of rupees:

1918.—Net exports, 81; Council drafts, 41; reverse drafts, 5.

1919.—Net exports, 125; Council drafts, 33; reverse drafts, 2.

1920.—Net imports, 43; Council drafts, 2; reverse drafts, 47.

CENTRAL AND PROVINCIAL ELECTIONS.

Mr. ORMSBY-GORE asked the Secretary of State for India whether he will issue a White Paper giving a summary of the recent central and provincial elections in India, showing the number of votes polled and the majorities in each case?

Mr. MONTAGU: Yes, Sir; I hope to be able to do so in about a month's time.

ADEN.

Mr. ORMSBY-GORE asked the Secretary of State for India whether the revenues of Aden are still accounted for in the Indian Budget; whether Post Office receipts at Aden on the sale of stamps to civilians are credited to the Indian Expeditionary Force; and whether it is now proposed to separate Aden financially and administratively from India and incorporate it in British Somaliland, or whether it will be made a separate Crown Colony?

Mr. MONTAGU: The answer to the first part of the question is, pending further arrangements, in the affirmative; as regards the second part, I regret that I have no information; as regards the last part, subject to the assent of the Government of India, which is still awaited, Aden will be transferred to the Colonial Office, to which Department questions as to its future status should be addressed.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

TRADE BALANCES.

Mr. A. M. SAMUEL asked the Secretary of State for India what the estimated Indian trade balances for the years 1918-20 respectively amounted to; the dates upon which these balances were drawn, and the amounts in Council Bills and in Reverse Councils?

Mr. MONTAGU: The net balance of Indian trade in respect of merchandise and treasure on private account and the

Thursday, 3rd March, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

MILITARY ACCOUNTS DEPARTMENT.

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India what steps have been

taken for the reorganisation of the Military Accounts Department in India?

Mr. MONTAGU: A new method of preparing pay bills and regimental accounts, which is referred to by the Esher Committee, has been introduced in the Military Accounts Department from 1st January last. The Government of India are considering certain further questions regarding the system of military accounts and organisation of the Military Accounts Department, but I am not yet aware of the nature of their recommendations.

ARMY OFFICERS (TRAVELLING FACILITIES).

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether he will consider the question of the extension of the concession of form E to officers above the rank of captain when travelling by railway in India?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have recently considered this matter, in communication with the Government of India, but regret that I am unable to accept the suggestion.

GOVERNMENT MOTOR VEHICLES.

Sir T. POLSON asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Government of India have recently ordered 115 motor-car chassis from Italy; and whether he will take steps to represent to that Government the desirability of supporting home markets, especially during a period of such grave industrial depression and unemployment as the present?

Mr. MONTAGU: I would refer the hon. Member to the answers given yesterday to the hon. Member for Coventry (Mr. Manville), of which I will send him a copy.

Tuesday, 8th March, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

REGIMENTAL BANDS.

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India what arrangements are to be made in future for the upkeep of regimental bands in the Indian Army; whether the Government subscription is to be limited to Rs. 100 per mensem as in the past; and whether the bandmaster's

pay and housing, the cost of band instruments, music, etc., are to be still dependent on subscriptions deducted from the officers' pay?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have not yet had a reply to the inquiry sent to the Government of India as a result of the question asked by my hon. and gallant Friend on the 9th December, but will communicate with him as soon as I hear from India.

Wednesday, 9th March, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

POLICE PAY.

1. **Colonel Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India what is the pay per mensem of a police-constable in the different provinces of India; and whether that pay is considered sufficient to obtain a contented and loyal police service?

The **SECRETARY** of **STATE** for **INDIA** (Mr. Montagu): I regret that I have not complete particulars to enable me to reply fully to my hon. and gallant Friend's question, but I have asked the Government of India to send me the latest figures. I may say that considerable increases of pay have been granted during the last few years.

Sir C. YATE: When are we likely to have that information?

Mr. MONTAGU: I will try to get particulars as soon as I can, but local governments, as my hon. and gallant Friend is aware, have considerable discretion in raising police pay, and I am anxious to give him figures up to date. I will let him know as soon as I get the information.

ARMY RESERVE, WAR MEDAL.

2. **Colonel Sir A. HOLBROOK** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that, under existing regulations, officers of the Indian Army Reserve get no medal for service in India during the great War, and, that if they relinquish their volunteer commissions on joining the Indian Army Reserve of Officers, do not count such service as double for

[Sir A. Holbrook.] Volunteer officers' decoration; and whether, seeing that this may have an injurious effect on that force which the institution of a long-service decoration would remove, and that Indian Volunteers who were actually mobilised with the Territorials on 5th August, 1914, have been refused the Territorial war medal on the ground that they were not Territorials, he will consider the desirability of arranging that service by Europeans in different parts of India, either with the Volunteers or with the Indian Army, shall give the same claim to the 1914-18 medal as that rendered by a Regular soldier of the British Army who never changed his station in India during the whole of the War, and was in India prior to its outbreak?

Mr. MONTAGU: Officers of the Indian Army Reserve of Officers do not qualify for a medal by service in India during the War unless they were not ordinarily resident in India before the War. I am consulting the Government of India on the question of allowing a Volunteer officer whose name was removed from the roll of a Volunteer unit on his joining the Indian Army Reserve of Officers to count his Indian Army Reserve of Officers service as double service for the Volunteer Long Service Medal. I do not understand how an officer can have been mobilised with Territorials on 5th August, 1914, unless he was a Territorial officer, but if my hon. and gallant Friend has any particular case in mind I will look into it if he will give me particulars. I regret that I cannot consider that service in India by an Indian Service officer resident in India before the War should qualify for a medal on different lines from the rules applying to service in the United Kingdom of a British Service officer.

PENSIONS, PUBLIC WORKS AND FOREST OFFICERS.

3. **Sir A. HOLBROOK** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he will take steps to obtain information as regards the percentage of public works and forest officers with less than 20 years' service who refused to accept the new scheme for pensions; if he will say what is the difference in the purchasing power of a pension of Rs. 4,000 in England, taking Income Tax into account, in 1884

and at the present time; and whether, in view of the increase in the cost of living in England during the last 25 years, he is prepared to sanction a considerable increase in pensions fixed before 1894, and to allow the three years' probationary period formerly passed at Cooper's Hill by officers of the Forest Department to count for pension?

Mr. MONTAGU: The Government of India have been asked whether they can supply the information referred to in the first part of the question. A retired officer drawing a pension of Rs. 4,000 a year in this country, and possessing no other means would, at the present time, after deduction of Income Tax, receive, if single or a widower, £3 2s. 6d., and if married £16 12s. 6d. more per annum than in 1884. That is exclusive of any rebates for children or dependants to which he might be entitled under the present Finance Act. The purchasing power of his pension is no doubt less. I am not aware of arguments which would justify the suggestion in the last part of the question.

OPIMUM.

4. **Mr. GILBERT** asked the Secretary of State for India whether there is any arrangement in operation whereby the Indian Government supplies opium to Hong Kong; and what are the terms and duration of such arrangement?

Mr. MONTAGU: The agreement formerly existing for the supply by the Government of India of opium to the Government of Hong Kong has been renewed for a further period of five years, with certain modifications. Under the new agreement, which has effect for five years from the 1st January, 1921, Hong Kong will be supplied with ten chests of opium a month, at a fixed price. No obligation rests on the Government of Hong Kong to take any prescribed minimum quantity of opium.

12. **Mr. STEWART** asked the Secretary of State for India the amount of opium shipped from India to Hong Kong and the Straits Settlements, respectively, in 1920; whether such opium is for local consumption only; whether, if the amount shipped is in excess of local requirements, what steps, if any, are taken to prevent the surplus being smuggled into China; and whether any opium was shipped direct

from India to Macao and the Dutch East Indies and, if so, how much?

Mr. MONTAGU: I regret that complete information regarding the question asked by my hon. Friend is not available at present. I have asked the Government of India to supply it. As regards the prevention of smuggling from Hong Kong and the Straits Settlements into China, I will ask my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can furnish the information.

Sir J. D. REES: Will the right hon. Gentleman also ask whether the amount of opium grown in South China is not so large as to make the disposal of this small surplus a matter of no account whatever?

Mr. STEWART: Is there any limit to the amount that may be sent into the Dutch East Indies?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am not familiar with this question in detail. I would ask my hon. Friend to give me notice of his question.

Lieut.-Commander KENWORTHY: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that last year he informed me that the export of opium from India was very heavy indeed, and that the opium is very largely bought by Japanese merchants and taken into China under their different treaties? Will the sending of this opium from India be stopped?

Mr. MONTAGU: Stopped altogether?

Lieut.-Commander KENWORTHY: In unnecessary quantities.

Mr. MONTAGU: In unnecessary quantities, of course.

Sir J. D. REES: Will the right hon. Gentleman inquire whether the cultivation of opium in China is not great; and whether that is not really the overriding fact of the situation, and not these details?

Mr. MONTAGU: I should like to get my hon. Friend any information he desires, but I find difficulty in getting information in China. Perhaps he will address his question to the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs?

Lieut. - Commander KENWORTHY: Is it not a fact that there is no poppy

growing in China, except to a very limited extent which is strictly regulated?

Mr. MONTAGU: The information I have about China does not bear out that view.

DANGEROUS DRUGS.

5. Mr. GILBERT asked the Secretary of State for India whether there are any Pharmacy Acts in operation in India similar to those in this country; and whether it is proposed to introduce legislation in India similar to that of the Dangerous Drugs Act with a view to limit the use of such drugs to legitimate medical and scientific purposes?

Mr. MONTAGU: There are no Pharmacy Acts in operation in India similar to those in this country. It is not proposed to introduce legislation in India similar to the Dangerous Drugs Act, as the regulation of the traffic in and use of such drugs is already strictly controlled under a variety of Local and Imperial Acts. I may add for the information of the hon. Member that it is believed that the law and the practice in India in respect of all such drugs are entirely in accord with the provisions of The Hague Convention; the Government of India were, however, requested some time ago to examine the whole body of law and regulations on this subject, and to effect such amendments, if any, as might be required in order to bring their law and practice into precise conformity with the provisions of the Convention.

ARMY PAY AND ALLOWANCES.

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India if he can now state what steps have been taken to carry into effect the recommendations in Part V of the Esher Report in regard to the improvements in the conditions of service of the personnel of the Army in India, which are so long overdue.

Mr. MONTAGU: As a result of the recommendations in Part V of the Esher Committee Report the following measures have now been sanctioned:

British officers, both of the British and Indian Services will receive free forage and saddlery, an allowance of Rs.15 per mensem for a syce, and will be able to buy chargers at concessional rates. British Service officers will cease to receive horse allowance. Indian Army officers. on the introduction of these

[Mr. Montagu.] measures, will be liable to have the number of authorised chargers reduced and the pay of cavalry assimilated to that of infantry as recommended in the Report. The sum of 19 lakhs has, in addition, been provided for pay concessions for British officers of the Indian Army, but it has not yet been decided how far the precise proposals in Section II of Part V of the Report will be followed.

As regards Indian officers, increases of pay, pension, family pension, and travelling allowances have been sanctioned and equipment will be issued free on promotion.

As regards Indian other ranks, improved scales of pay, good service, and good conduct pay have been approved.

The main proposals for improved family pensions have been accepted in principle, but the details are not yet settled. The same applies as regards disability pensions, both for Indian officers and other Indian ranks.

The pay of religious teachers will be raised as recommended.

A grant will be given in respect of Hindustani clothing, but in what form has not yet been settled.

Charpoys and kit boxes will be provided free, and also free lighting.

The contract allowance system in regimental offices will be abolished. An establishment of enlisted clerks has been sanctioned, and Government will supply stationery, etc.

Seven lakhs will be provided for the improvement of Indian Army schools.

Sir C. YATE: Does the right hon. Gentleman state that chargers are not to be provided by the Government? Will officers still have to purchase their own chargers?

Mr. MONTAGU: I think that the proposals I have read out were in the precise form of the Esher Committee's recommendations.

TROOPS (SERVICE OUTSIDE INDIA).

Lord H. CAVENDISH-BENTINCK asked the Secretary of State for India whether it was one of the terms of recruitment for Indian troops that they should not be employed outside the Indian

Empire; how many such troops are at present serving outside India; and in what theatres they are employed.

Mr. MONTAGU: No, Sir. Indian troops are enlisted for "general service." On February 1st there were 121,800 Indian troops serving outside the Indian Empire—this excludes followers. These numbers are fast being reduced and it is anticipated that they will be reduced to less than half by the end of the present month. The theatres of employment are:—

Mesopotamia and Persia,
Egypt and Palestine,
The Black Sea Area,
Aden,
Hong Kong,
The Malay States, and
North China.

ARMY ORGANISATION.

8. Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS had given notice of the following question: To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is yet in a position to make a full statement as to the Army position in India?

Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS: This question has been postponed, but I would like my right hon. Friend to continue his undertaking that there shall be no further reductions in the meantime.

Mr. MONTAGU: Certainly. There will be no further reductions.

LORD RAWLINSON (COUNCIL OF STATE SPEECH).

9. Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS asked the Secretary of State for India whether he can state the nature of the proposals made to the Council of State on the 3rd instant by Sir William Vincent which were opposed by Lord Rawlinson?

Mr. MONTAGU: The hon. Baronet's question is evidently based on a Press message which appeared in Monday's newspapers, in which Lord Rawlinson is reported as having stated in the Council of State that the Government would be extremely lucky if the country escaped sporadic disorders in the next month, that he strongly objected to certain proposals of Sir William Vincent, and that owing to attacks made upon them officers were already showing signs of losing their initiative. I felt sure, when I saw this message, that Lord Rawlinson must have

been misreported, and I at once telegraphed to India for the facts. I am informed, in reply, that there is no truth in any of the allegations, that none of the subjects referred to were even mentioned in the Commander-in-Chief's speech, and the Commander-in-Chief asks that a categorical denial should be made. Sir William Vincent, in a speech in the course of the Debate reported, alluded to possible sporadic disorders and to the possible effect on officers of such proposals as those put forward by Mr. Sastri, the mover of the resolution under discussion. I find that the Press report is correct that six out of the eight proposals made by Mr. Sastri were rejected by the Council, and I gather that the two that were accepted were not regarded by the Government of India as unreasonable. I would add that Reuter's, to whom I think we are greatly indebted for the information sent from, and conveyed to, India with general accuracy, have expressed to me their regrets for the unfortunate mistakes connected with this telegram.

Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS: Is there nothing that can be done in India to prevent these wicked reports being sent over here? Can my right hon. Friend ask the Indian Government to take any steps to see that Reuter does not telegraph absurd misstatements of this kind?

Mr. MONTAGU: I know that nobody regrets these mistakes more than Reuter themselves. Of course, we have no control over private messages sent by Press agencies from one to the other, but in the bulk of telegrams which Reuter receives the general accuracy is highly to be commended, and I am quite sure that Reuter will take steps to try to avoid by every means the possibility of an important mistake of this kind occurring again.

Mr. HURD: Are any British State moneys involved in messages passing from India?

Mr. MONTAGU: I do not know that. It is a matter between Reuter and their representatives in India.

COST OF LIVING, STATISTICS.

10. **Colonel WEDGWOOD** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he has any statistics corresponding to the statistics issued monthly by the Board of

Trade in this country to show the rise in the cost of living in India due to the War and the present variations in such cost of living; and, if not, will he, with a view to diminishing labour unrest in India, have such statistics prepared?

Mr. MONTAGU: The Government of India have for some time been publishing a monthly statement of the "percentage increase of retail food prices in Calcutta since July, 1914." The Indian Statistical Department is now examining the possibility of publishing weighted comparative figures of the cost of living for the main towns of India on the model of the Board of Trade figures.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that food prices are not the only element in the cost of living, and that the cost of clothing has gone up more than the cost of food?

Mr. MONTAGU: Yes. That is why the Indian Statistical Department is considering the publication of figures comparable with the Board of Trade returns.

Sir J. D. REES: Has the collection of statistics ever anywhere had any effect in allaying unrest?

Mr. MONTAGU: I imagine that that information is always useful.

FISCAL COMMISSION.

11. **Colonel WEDGWOOD** asked the Secretary of State for India whether the personnel of the Committee which will inquire into the fiscal arrangements in India has been settled; what will be the proportion of the Indian representatives; whether the Legislative Assembly or any other Indian body will be able to nominate one or more representatives on that body; whether the proposals made by that Committee will be embodied in a Bill and voted by the Legislative Assembly before any action will be taken; and will he assure the House that in no case action will be taken over the head of the Legislative Assembly?

Mr. MONTAGU: Nothing has yet been decided regarding the personnel of the Indian Fiscal Commission. Effect cannot be given to the proposals of the Commission without the introduction of a Bill in the Legislative Assembly. I will send my hon. and gallant Friend a copy

[Mr. Montagu.]
of the announcement made on this subject by the Finance Member.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: If there is to be a Committee or Commission appointed to inquire into the fiscal arrangements of India, would it not be possible to make it a Committee of the Legislative Assembly and the Council of State joint—an Indian Commission rather than an English Commission?

Mr. MONTAGU: The hon. Member will remember that there was a Committee of the old Legislative Council last year, which recommended to the Government the appointment of an expert Commission, and it is in following that advice that the Government of India propose to appoint a Committee.

Thursday, 10th March, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

WAR EXPENDITURE.

Colonel WEDGWOOD asked the Secretary of State for India the total amount of expenditure incurred by British India on her own account and on account of the British Exchequer, respectively, in connection with the War from the beginning of hostilities to the last year for which accounts are available; whether any committee with Indian opinion adequately represented has investigated such expenditure; what authority has adjusted and audited the proportion of expenditure recoverable from this country; what compensation India is being, or will be given, for the delay in adjustment of accounts resulting in serious loss through exchange; whether India will receive interest at a reasonable rate on long delayed payments; and what facilities he proposes to give Indians to satisfy themselves that in the adjustment of the accounts, which run into large sums of money, Indian interests have been duly safeguarded?

Mr. MONTAGU: Including the contribution of £100,000,000 towards the cost of the War offered by the Indian Legislative Council in 1917, and the cost of the

Afghan and Frontier operations in 1919-20, the War expenditure borne by India up to 31st March, 1920, was about £127,000,000. The expenditure incurred on behalf of the British Exchequer during the same period was about £301,600,000. The expenditure has been apportioned between Imperial and Indian revenues on the basis of the Parliamentary Resolutions of 1914; the arrangements for adjustment were devised by the Government of India and the India Office, in consultation with the Imperial Departments and the Comptroller and Auditor-General in India, and Indian audit has throughout been accepted by His Majesty's Government. In these circumstances no Committee such as that suggested seems called for. I am not aware of any loss through exchange in connection with the adjustment of the accounts. There has ordinarily been no delay whatever in payment, as the Imperial Government have advanced month by month, from the commencement of the War, the approximate sums estimated by the Government of India and this Office as likely to be disbursed each month on behalf of His Majesty's Government. It is the duty of the Comptroller and Auditor-General in India and of the Auditor of the Home Accounts in England to audit the adjustments with the Imperial Government, and I have no reason to think that Indian interests have not been duly safeguarded in the matter.

RAILWAY AND INLAND STEAMER TRAFFIC (SURCHARGE).

Mr. A. SHAW asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in order to meet the increase in the cost of working the railways, the Government of India propose greatly to increase the surcharge on traffic by inland vessels as well as by railway; whether he is aware that the inland steamship carriers, though performing essential transport services, have not received any guarantee from the Government and have never asked for any assistance at public expense; and whether he can give any information regarding this proposal to tax the inland waterways transport, already gravely damaged by the War, for the benefit of the railways?

Mr. MONTAGU: The object of the proposed increase in the surcharge on railway and inland steamer traffic is to raise

additional revenue. As my hon. Friend is aware, when the surcharge was first imposed in 1917 it applied to inland steamer transport as well as to railways, and the proposal to follow this precedent on the present occasion is directed to maintaining the existing equality of treatment. The whole question will come up for further consideration in connection with the contemplated revision of railways rates, which is to be undertaken without delay.

Saturday, 12th March, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

OFFICER'S MEDICAL EXPENSES.

Mr. A. HERBERT asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that Lieutenant A. E. Brown, M.C., 2nd/107th Pioneers, Indian Army, was admitted to hospital in Tripoli, Syria, on 16th December, 1918, suffering from enteric fever, was removed to the 19th General Hospital, Alexandria, on 12th January, 1919, and arrived at the 3rd London General Hospital on 6th March, 1919; that he was discharged from hospital on the 17th March, 1919; and that while on sick leave he contracted pneumonia in December, 1919; and whether, in the circumstances, he will consider the possibility of refunding from Army funds the expenses in respect of medical and nursing fees then incurred by him?

Mr. MONTAGU: Lieutenant Brown applied to the India Office on 23rd April, 1920, for refund of his medical expenses, and was informed that in accordance with the Regulations he should apply for the same to the General Officer Commanding the District in which he was residing. On 12th July at his request a Medical Report as to the cause of his disability was furnished by this Office to the Director-General of Medical Services in the Eastern Command. Any question as to the delay in the settlement of his account should be addressed to my

Right Hon. Friend the Secretary of State for War.

INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Ordered, "That the Lords Message [9th March] relating to the appointment of a Committee on Indian Affairs be now considered."—[*Colonel Gibbs.*]

Lords' Message considered accordingly.

Motion made, and Question proposed—

"That a Select Committee of eleven Members be appointed to join with a Committee appointed by the Lords as a Standing Joint Committee on Indian Affairs."—[*Colonel Gibbs.*]

Colonel Sir C. YATE: I wished to ask the Secretary of State for India a question, and I am sorry he is not present. I wanted to know why he has not carried out his undertaking, given last year, that when the Government of India Act came into force a fresh Committee would be appointed? The House will recollect that the Montagu-Chelmsford Report laid it down that the House of Commons should be asked to appoint a Select Committee on Indian affairs at the beginning of each Session and it then went on to say that there would then soon grow up a body of men in Parliament who would take a continuous and well-informed interest in Indian questions. The point I wish to bring to the right hon. Gentleman's notice—and I am glad to see he has now come in—is that it is impossible for a body of well-informed men to ever grow up in this House if the same Committee is to be appointed year after year. I raised this question last year and I think it my duty to raise it again now, because twelve months ago the Secretary of State, in reply to me, distinctly stated that the Committee would only continue in existence until the Government of India Act was working, and when that Act did come into operation another Committee would be appointed. The Government of India Act is now in operation, and I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the time has not come when he should fulfil his undertaking to appoint a fresh Committee and not re-appoint the original members of it? This is the third year that the same original members have been appointed to

[Sir C. Yate.]

this Committee. Great and difficult questions will arise this year in connection with the Government of Burma. The right hon. Gentleman knows quite well that there are great diversities of opinion on this subject between himself and the Government of India, and he is introducing a Bill into this House in opposition to the wishes and will of the Government of India. It is not fair that these original six men should be appointed, five of whom are absolutely pledged, by their speeches in the second reading Debate, to vote in favour of his Bill. These men were appointed again last year when the Government of India Bill was passed. The same question arises this year, except that, while last year the divergence of opinion was between the governments of the Provinces and the right hon. Gentleman, this year it is between the Government of India and the right hon. Gentleman. Under the recommendations of the Montagu-Chelmsford Report, and also under the undertaking given by the right hon. Gentleman himself last year, as soon as the Government of India Bill came into force an entirely fresh Committee was to be appointed. The right hon. Gentleman ought to fulfil that undertaking, and not continue the same men on the Committee who are already, as one may say, promised to support his opinion as against that of the Government. I would ask the right hon. Gentleman to say for what reason he is continuing the appointment of these men for a third year, against the Montagu-Chelmsford Report and against his undertaking of last year. I know that he has added five men to the Committee, but I think that an entirely new Committee should be appointed.

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Montagu): I really do not see how I have broken any undertaking. This is an entirely new Committee for a different purpose and composed of a different number of men. It is the Committee which was recommended in the Montagu-Chelmsford Report—a recommendation which was endorsed and modified by the Joint Select Committee of last year. That Joint Select Committee was appointed for a particular Bill. This Committee is appointed to advise the House on Indian affairs

generally, and it is proposed that it shall be a Sessional Committee. If the hon. Baronet says that any Member who has ever taken part in the discussion of Indian affairs upstairs on a Committee is *ipso facto* disqualified from serving on this Sessional Committee, I think it would be a very bad argument to use to the House of Commons. There are many men on this Committee who have not served on the last Committee, and there are many who did serve on the last Committee but who by no means take the same view necessarily on the Burma Bill. When we are inviting the House to make a choice as to the Members appointed, those who have served the House on the previous Committee are, surely, not to be disqualified from serving on the new Committee that is appointed.

Question put, and agreed to.

Committee accordingly nominated of Mr. Acland, Sir Thomas Bennett, Sir Henry Craik, Major Glyn, Mr. Ormsby-Gore, Sir William Joynson-Hicks, Sir J. D. Rees, Mr. Spoor, Sir Charles Townshend, Colonel Wedgwood, and Lieut.-Commander Hilton Young.

ORDERED, that the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, that Five be the quorum.—
[Colonel Gibbs.]

Message to the Lords to acquaint them therewith.

Monday, 14th March, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

DIVORCE DECREES.

48. Sir W. DAVISON asked the Prime Minister whether his attention has been called to a recent decision of the President of the Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division of the High Court of Justice, which decides that decrees for the dissolution of marriages granted by the courts in India in the case of persons resident in India who had an English domicile are invalid; whether he is aware

that this decision will make illegitimate the children of hundreds of second marriages in the cases of persons with an English domicile who have been divorced in India since 1869; and what action the Government propose to take in the matter?

47. **Sir J. D. REES** asked the Prime Minister whether the judgment of the President of the Probate and Divorce Court deciding that decrees granted by the courts in India dissolving marriages contracted in India between residents in that country possessing an English domicile are invalid has been brought under his notice; and whether, in view of the serious resulting consequences, early legislation is contemplated?

The ATTORNEY - GENERAL (Sir Gordon Hewart): I have been asked to answer these questions. I am aware of the judgment referred to, and of its consequences, and I understand that legislation upon the matter may shortly be expected.

RAILWAY GOODS RATES.

76. **Sir T. BENNETT** asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Government of India contemplates raising five and a half crores of rupees of revenue by means of a surcharge on the existing scale of goods rates on railways; and whether he is aware that this method is open to the objection that while it may lead to a falling off in traffic it will bring in no additional revenue to the railways, who have to provide for a continually increasing expenditure, as well as for renewals and betterments, which, owing to the War, have unavoidably remained in abeyance, and that the alternative course of raising rates and fares would at once provide the State and the railways with the necessary addition to their resources without the discouragement to the inflow of capital, British and Indian, into Indian railway investments which is likely to follow the adoption of the surcharge policy.

Mr. PARKER (Lord of the Treasury): The answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. I recognise the objections to the tax to which my hon. Friend refers, and for this reason the increase in the surcharge is intended to

be temporary only pending a revision of the rates, which will be effected as soon as practicable.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

PEACE TREATIES.

TURKEY AND GREECE.

Colonel WEDGWOOD asked the Prime Minister whether he can give the House any information as to the modification of the Sèvres Treaty; and whether the India Office has been consulted respecting this modification?

The PRIME MINISTER: The proposed modifications were submitted to the Turkish and Greek delegations on Saturday and have already been published. The British delegates were in full possession of the views of India on the subject.

Tuesday, 15th March, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES.

Mr. W. CARTER asked the Secretary of State for India how many persons are at present on strike in India as a result of industrial disputes; what are the chief points at issue; and what trades and districts are involved?

Mr. MONTAGU: The latest information I have relates to the week ending 16th February. On that date there were ten strikes in operation in India. The number of employes involved appears to have been about 20,000. The disputes were generally about wages, but in one or two cases no economic demands were put forward and the causes at work may have been of a political character. The industries affected were railway workshops, tramways, motor works, a saw mill, a cotton mill, and oil installations. The areas affected were Bombay, Calcutta, Madras, Lucknow, the Punjab and Rangoon.

Wednesday, 16th March, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

TRADE UNIONS.

1. Colonel WEDGWOOD asked the Secretary of State for India whether any action is contemplated in India to legalise trade unions and to give them the rights possessed by trade unions in this country?

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Montagu): The Government of India have accepted a resolution, passed by the Legislative Assembly on the 1st March, recommending the introduction as soon as practicable of legislation regarding the registration and protection of trade unions. They propose to introduce a Bill after consulting Local Governments.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: Can we be assured that the Bill will prevent trade union executives being sued for damages caused by strikes?

Mr. MONTAGU: I cannot give any further information than that which I have received by telegraph. As soon as I know what the contents of the Bill are I will let the hon. and gallant Gentleman know.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: Would it not be possible to communicate with the Government of India urging that it should be quite clear that trade union leaders should not any longer be liable for actions such as that brought against Mr. Wadia?

Sir C. YATE: Would the right hon. Gentleman think it advisable to communicate with the Government of India in an exactly contrary sense?

Mr. J. JONES: Why not do the same here and face the music?

COLLEGE STRIKE, BURMA.

2. Colonel WEDGWOOD asked the Secretary of State for India whether the college strike in Burma still continues; and, if so, whether he proposes to take any steps to bring about more favourable conditions for co-operation in that country?

Mr. MONTAGU: The latest information that I have is that this strike or boy-

cott is continuing on a somewhat extensive scale. The local Government has publicly announced its readiness to convene a conference, on which there shall be substantial unofficial representation, to examine the system of education in Anglo-Vernacular schools and to submit recommendations for improving it. I trust that reasonable counsels will prevail at no distant date.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: Will this Commission have any power to suggest modifications in the University of Rangoon Act?

Mr. MONTAGU: That I do not now.

SHWE DAGON PAGODA.

3. Colonel WEDGWOOD asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware of the feeling in Burma relative to the occupation by the military of part of the grounds of the Shwe Dagon pagoda and the consequent blocking of one of the entrances to the pagoda; and whether, in view of this feeling, he will consider the retrocession of this land to its original religious use?

Mr. MONTAGU: I would refer my hon. and gallant Friend to the answer I gave to the hon. Member for Wentworth on 3rd November, of which I will send him a copy. A committee is assembling at Rangoon to work out details for the evacuation of the arsenal from the precincts of the pagoda, and its location elsewhere.

ARMY OFFICERS (RAILWAY TRAVELLING).

4. Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether, considering the comparatively small difference in pay between senior captains and majors, and the great expenses entailed on married officers in India, he will communicate with the Government of India with a view to a reconsideration of the question of the extension of Form E to officers above the rank of captain when travelling by railway in India?

Mr. MONTAGU: I would refer to the reply I gave to the hon. and gallant Member on 3rd March.

Sir C. YATE: Cannot the right hon. Gentleman take any steps in this matter considering the great hardship this is considered in India?

Mr. MONTAGU: No, I am afraid I cannot reconsider this question. It has been carefully considered by my Council and myself, and I think the decision we have come to is the right one.

Sir C. YATE: When was it considered?

Mr. MONTAGU: The hon. and gallant Gentleman has made many representations to me and has asked very many questions, and each time he has asked a question I have given very careful consideration to it.

Sir C. YATE: I have no recollection of any questions myself. How many years ago was it considered?

CONTRACTS (NON-FULFILMENT).

6. **Mr. CLOUGH** asked the Secretary of State for India whether the native movement to refuse payment of legal debts to British firms except at the rate of 10 rupees to the £ sterling possesses a purely commercial character, or whether also it is due in part to political reasons?

Mr. MONTAGU: The loss occasioned by the fall in exchange (amounting in some cases to 40 per cent.) coupled with persistently low rupee prices for cotton piece goods affords strong inducement to find excuses for evasion of contract. An unfunded contention has been set up that Government had given an undertaking to stabilise the rupee at 2s. and some defaulters are sheltering behind this plea. During the general discussion on the Budget, which took place recently in the Indian Legislative Assembly, it was contended by representatives of Indian commercial interests that non-fulfilment of contracts was not due to any lack of morality, but purely to actual inability to pay, some speakers indeed alleging that unless some settlement were arrived at wholesale bankruptcy would follow. I understand, however, that the banks are doing their best to enable liquidation of the position to be carried through without undue embarrassment, and I trust that a course of repudiation which must be injurious to India's commercial credit throughout the world will not be persisted in.

RAILWAY AND INLAND STEAMER TRAFFIC.

7. **Mr. FRANCE** asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Indian railways will show a deficit which it is pro-

posed to meet by raising the surcharge upon inland steamer traffic as well as upon railway traffic; and whether he is aware that the effect of this will be further to subsidise the railways, while leaving steamer companies, which have no subsidy, unable to readjust their freight rates so as to make receipts balance expenses?

9. **Mr. A. HOPKINSON** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that the effect of meeting the prospective deficit on railways out of public revenue acts with unfairness towards the inland steamer companies by enabling the railways, who already are subsidised by Government, to maintain artificially low rates which prevent the steamer companies, who receive no assistance from public funds, from adjusting their rates to an economic level; and whether this attitude towards private enterprise in competition with State subsidised concerns has the approval of his department?

Mr. MONTAGU: The surcharge which has been imposed upon Indian railways was not for the purpose of meeting a railway deficit but as a tax for the purpose of raising additional revenue. The whole of the surcharge goes to the State and it is imposed also on steamer traffic. But railway rates are about to be reconsidered forthwith and on this reconsideration the position of steamship companies will then be taken into account.

FISCAL POLICY.

10. **Mr. WADDINGTON** asked the Secretary of State for India whether, since the Armistice, the attention of the Government of India has been drawn to the need of appointing a Commission to arrange a fiscal policy for India which should have regard to the mutual interests of India and the other portions of the British Empire; and, if so, if he will say when the representations were made and the reason the Commission was not formed before any change was made in import duties which raise controversial issues?

Mr. MONTAGU: The proposal to appoint a Commission to examine the question of the future fiscal policy of India was made in April, 1920, by a Committee of the Legislative Council which had been appointed under a Resolution of the Council to report, among other things, "as to the best method of considering the future fiscal policy of India."

[Mr. Montagu.]

The Government of India considered that such a commission would most appropriately be appointed after the inauguration of the constitutional changes and with the approval of the new Legislature, but while the question of appointing this Commission was still under consideration, the Government of India found themselves faced with a large deficit in their accounts, and decided that an all-round increase in import duties was necessary to produce the required addition to their revenues.

COTTON DUTIES.

11. **Mr. WADDINGTON** asked the Secretary of State for India what revenue was obtained in the latest year for which returns are available from the $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Excise Duty on Indian cotton manufactures, also the revenue from the $7\frac{1}{2}$ Import Duty on cotton manufactures, showing the amount of revenue, respectively, received from British cottons, Japanese cottons, and American cottons; and whether he can state the amount of revenue expected from the increase to 11 per cent. of the Import Duties on cotton goods?

Mr. MONTAGU: The latest year for which returns are available is 1919-20. In that year the Excise Duty produced 155 lakhs and the Import Duty 409 lakhs, of which about 353 lakhs was obtained from goods imported from the United Kingdom, 39 lakhs from Japanese and $3\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs from American goods. The increase of revenue expected by the Government of India from the higher duty next year is 120 lakhs.

DISTURBANCES, NANKANA.

12. **Sir J. D. REES** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he can give the House any information regarding the position at Nankana; and whether the dispute is one regarding the management of the Nankana shrine or has any political significance?

Mr. MONTAGU: I can add little to the *communiqués* published on the 25th February and the 8th March. The dispute arose over the management of the shrine, and is a religious dispute inside the Sikh community, but, as is natural, the Sikhs are dangerously excited by the killing of so many of their faith. The Punjab Government is using every endeavour to bring the offenders to justice.

INDIAN AFFAIRS (STANDING JOINT COMMITTEE).

16. **Mr. ORMSBY-GORE** asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Joint Committee of both Houses of Parliament will have any duties other than considering legislation proposed in either House affecting the Indian Empire, and, if so, what?

Mr. MONTAGU: It is for the Committee itself to interpret its terms of reference, which are very wide. I certainly hope that it will not confine itself to considering legislation.

Mr. ORMSBY-GORE: Are we to understand that any questions like these fiscal questions are to be referred to this Committee?

Mr. MONTAGU: I understand that the Committee has received from both Houses of Parliament the terms of reference to advise the Houses of Parliament on Indian affairs. I would rather leave it to the Committee as to how it should discharge its responsibilities.

Sir H. CRAIK: Will it not be necessary for the business of the Committee that questions should be referred to it by the India Office if they are to give such advice as is desired? Would it not be very difficult for the Committee to select points?

Mr. MONTAGU: Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will discuss that with his colleagues on his Committee.

Sir C. YATE: Will the House be given information as to the questions which are to be referred to this Committee?

Mr. MONTAGU: I think so.

GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS (PASSAGES).

17. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India what has been the result of his communication with the Government of India with regard to the cheapening of the cost of passages for Government officials to and from India; and, if nothing has been done, will he consider the question of the grant of free passages at stated intervals to all civil and military officers serving under the Government of India as part of their conditions of service?

Mr. MONTAGU: I would refer the hon. and gallant Member to my answer on the

same subject given on the 2nd instant. I am still awaiting a final reply from the Government of India.

Sir C. YATE: When is the reply expected?

Mr. MONTAGU: As far as my recollection serves me, I received a telegram on the 26th February to say that their recommendations would reach me at a very early date. I have no further information.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

INLAND WATER TRAFFIC (SURCHARGE).

Mr. A. SHAW asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that the surcharge upon inland steamer as well as railway traffic imposed in 1917 was avowed to be of a temporary character only and was acquiesced in by the steamer companies during the War for patriotic reasons alone; and whether all such surcharges on inland waterway-carried traffic will be abolished?

Mr. MONTAGU: The answer to the first part of my hon. Friend's inquiry so far as it relates to the temporary character of the surcharge is in the affirmative. As regards the second part, I have already informed him that the whole question will come up for further consideration at an early date, and I will communicate with the Government of India on the point raised by my hon. Friend.

MEDICAL SERVICE (TRAVELLING FACILITIES).

Lieut.-Colonel RAW asked the Secretary of State for India when the long-promised concessions to officers in the Indian Medical Service with regard to passages to and from India on duty will be brought into operation?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am not clear as to what the hon. and gallant Member has in mind. Officers proceeding to and from India on duty are granted free passages. Possibly the hon. and gallant Member is thinking of officers proceeding on sick leave. In these cases I sanctioned the grant of free passages in June of last year.

Thursday 17th March, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

EUROPEANS (DIVORCE DECREES).

Sir J. D. REES asked the Secretary of State for India what action he proposes to take in view of the decision recently affirmed by the Courts to the effect that divorce granted by the Indian High Courts to Europeans not technically domiciled in India are invalid in this country?

Mr. MONTAGU: It is proposed to ask Parliament to pass a validating Act, and the necessary steps will be taken with the least possible delay.

COTTON MILLS.

Sir W. BARTON asked the Secretary of State for India what was the amount of the total capital employed and the amount of the profits made by Indian cotton mills for the year 1914 and each succeeding year to 1920; and what taxes were paid by them in each of such years, other than Excise duties, and differentiating between Income Tax, Super-tax, or any other form of taxation?

Mr. MONTAGU: The latest returns of paid-up capital employed in cotton mills in British India (including debentures), so far as known, were as follows, in lakhs of rupees:

1914-15	2,133
1915-16	2,119
1916-17	2,148
1917-18	2,248
1918-19	2,623

There are no official returns of the profits of cotton mills. Complete returns of the Income Tax paid during the above years by owners of cotton spinning and weaving mills are not available, but figures for 1916-17 show that 153 companies paid Rs.10,93,579, and 381 other assesseees Rs.97,540. I have no returns showing the amounts of Super-tax or Excess Profits Duty that have been paid by cotton mills.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT, 1921-22.

Sir D. MACLEAN asked the Secretary of State for India whether he will circulate the Indian Budget taxation

proposals now before the Legislative Assembly?

Mr. MONTAGU: Yes, Sir. I will circulate these proposals with the OFFICIAL REPORT. They have already been communicated in this form to the Press.

The proposals referred to are as follow:

INDIAN FINANCIAL STATEMENT, 1921-22.

The Financial Statement of the Government of India was presented in the Indian Legislative Assembly by the Finance Member, Mr. W. M. Hailey, C.S.I., C.I.E., on 1st March, 1921. The chief features of his speech were as follows:—

1. The Finance Member contrasted his position with that of his predecessor, and emphasised the effects of constitutional changes. He observed that the substance of the advance given by the Government of India Act lay in the fact that all proposals for expenditure were practically subject to votes of the House, and further that their power to decide on additional taxation was still more decisive. The House would have now to share the responsibility which had been Government's in the past, but he welcomed this partnership. The world would judge this great constitutional experiment by the critical test of their management of Indian finances.

2. General characteristics of 1920-21. The past year had seen far-reaching changes in the trade and financial conditions of the country. The outlook in March last had been generally bright; the Armistice had been followed by general trade boom; exchange was high, the monsoon of 1919 had been excellent, and public revenue had grown. The trade boom had, however, passed away, leaving a trough of depression. Consequently, there had been a violent swing of the pendulum and, since September last, a large balance of trade against India. This, with a disappointing monsoon, had had a large effect on public finances.

3. Exchange and Currency. Exchange had fallen from 2s. 7d. a year ago to the neighbourhood of 1s. 4d. now. To attribute present trade conditions to a currency policy which had not been made effective was to invert the facts. The Finance Member did not pretend that Government expectations had not been falsified, nor that the attempt to make them good had not to some extent contributed to the excess of imports. The new policy had had to contend against particularly adverse forces. The fall of the London-New York rate made the rise in the rupee exchange, necessary to give effect to this policy, far steeper than had been anticipated. In supporting the market last year, the Government had hoped that abnormal conditions would improve, but as time went on it became impossible to resist the conclusion that this anticipation was unsafe. Government efforts to maintain exchange for the time being had failed, but first, their anticipations at the time were not unreasonable and were largely shared by commercial

men, and, secondly, the causes which led Government to abandon their efforts were beyond their control. For the present, in the opinion of the Finance Member, there was no practical step which Government could take to end trade depression and general uncertainty. No Government could control the present factors, nor could any new committee propound an immediate or radical solution. Still he was not pessimistic about the future. The main reason for optimism was the fact that India's own position is inherently sound. The recent return of rupees from circulation was in his mind a healthy sign, marking the transition from higher to lower prices.

In course of remarks on exchange question, Finance Member, after referring to so-called assurance given by Government last year regarding maintenance of rate of exchange, asked House to remember that he definitely told Legislative Council last year that it was impossible to say what variations might take place in rupee-sterling exchange throughout the year. Ordinary commercial prudence should have led merchants to cover their exchange. Common commercial morality, at all events, should prevent those who desired to dishonour their contracts from pleading so unsubstantial an excuse as the failure of Government to make its policy good. He could imagine no severer blow to the international credit of India than that there should be a general movement on the part of some section of her merchants to announce a policy of general repudiation.

4. Revenue and Expenditure, 1920-21. Allowing for the disappearance of the Budget provision of Rs. 8½ crores for meeting deficiency in the Paper Currency Reserve, the anticipation of Rs. 10½ crores surplus had become a deficit of Rs. 11½ crores. Total military expenditure was Rs. 70.4 crores against the Budget figure of Rs. 55.2 crores. Rs. 12 crores out of Rs. 15½ crores of excess were due to war operations.

5. Budget, 1921-22. Estimated expenditure was Rs. 129 crores against revenue on existing taxation of Rs. 110½ crores, including the provincial contributions of Rs. 9.83 crores. The Finance Member said that civil expenditure was on the lowest possible scale. The Budget had been framed on a 2s. sterling basis, but Rs. 5.42 crores had been provided for adjustment on account of exchange based on an average rate for the year of 1s. 8d. He would hesitate to commit himself to any prophecies regarding exchange, but present probabilities point to a low rate during the first half-year, but with a likely substantial recovery in the second half if there were a good monsoon. Largest item was provision made for defence, namely, Rs. 62.2 crores, of which Rs. 4 crores was extraordinary. The Finance Member explained that the actual combatant strength of the post-War Army was actually smaller than that of 1913-14. Military authorities had pressed for a higher figure, but even the present sum was not one that Government could contemplate with equanimity on financial grounds. He asked the House to believe that nothing had been left undone

to keep the Budget figure within its lowest bounds, and assured the House that every effort was being made for financial control of Army expenditure. The final deficit was Rs.18½ crores, and ordinary prudence demanded aiming at a reasonable surplus.

6. Proposals for additional taxation.

A. Under Customs.

(1) Increase of general ad valorem duty of 7½ per cent. to 11 per cent., except for matches and certain luxuries, but including manufactures. Additional revenue of 384 lakhs was anticipated.

No increase was proposed in cotton excise duties. The Government of India had made it clear to His Majesty's Government that the sole object was additional revenue, and that there was no ulterior motive of any kind. No change was proposed in regard to articles under present ad valorem 2½ per cent., but concessions allowing machinery and stores for cotton mills entry free of duty would be withdrawn. Additional revenue of 10 lakhs was anticipated.

(2) Replacement of present ad valorem 7½ per cent. duty on matches by specific duty of 12 annas per gross of boxes. Additional revenue of 110 lakhs was anticipated.

(3) Increase of rates on imported liquors at 3 annas per degree of proof per gallon. Additional revenue of 94 lakhs was anticipated.

(4) Increase of general ad valorem duty of 7½ per cent. to 20 per cent. on such luxuries as motor cars, motor cycles and tyres (excluding lorries), silk piece goods, clocks, watches, musical instruments, plate and other manufactures of gold and silver, and certain other articles. Additional revenue of 114 lakhs was anticipated.

(5) Increase of duty from 10 to 15 per cent. on foreign sugar. This is expected to yield 65 lakhs.

(6) Import duties on tobacco, other than unmanufactured tobacco, to be increased by 50 per cent. Estimated additional revenue, 40 lakhs.

B. Further, Finance Member said that net income from railways was decreasing, and moderate increase of rates, especially on goods traffic, was justifiable. Adjustment of rates, however, required careful consideration, and as temporary measure he proposed to increase present surcharge to (1) 6 pies per maund on coal, coke, firewood, food grains and fodder; (2) 2 annas per maund on certain valuable commodities, such as piece goods, pressed cotton, jute, iron-ware, timber and oils; (3) 1 anna per maund on all other articles of merchandise. Additional revenue, 5½ crores. The free zone would be increased from 10 miles to 20 miles.

C. Net revenues from postal department had also steadily diminished, and next year the department would be running at a loss. The Finance Member therefore proposed the following changes:—

(1) to abolish ½ anna post and substitute 1 anna up to 2½ tolas, with ½ anna for every additional 2½ tolas;

- (2) to raise ½ anna postcard to 1 anna;
- (3) to increase the rate for book, pattern and sample packets to ½ anna for 5 tolas;
- (4) the rate for registered newspapers to be increased to ½ anna for 5 tolas, and to 1 anna for 20 tolas;
- (5) the raising of the rates of commission on money orders. The above postal changes were estimated to bring in 225 lakhs.

D. To obtain the remaining revenue, Finance Member proposed that further direct taxation should be imposed by raising the present maximum of income tax rate from 12 pies to 16 pies. The present rates on smaller incomes would remain. The rates for super-tax would be also increased so as to work up to maximum of 4 annas on portion of income over 3½ lakhs. These measures would produce 325 lakhs.

The total yield of the proposals works out as follows:—

	Crores.
A.—Customs ...	8.17
B.—Railway surcharge ...	5.50
C.—Postal charges ...	2.25
D.—Taxes on income ...	3.25
Total	19.17

7. Ways and Means, 1920-21. The total liabilities, estimated at Rs.46 crores on a 2s. basis, actually amounted to Rs. 96 crores. The meeting of £31,000,000 of reverse bills had necessitated the Secretary of State's selling sterling securities in the Paper Currency Reserve valued on a 1s. 4d. basis. The net result was loss of Rs.17 crores with additional Rs.2½ crores from selling reverse bills above 2s. sterling. This with Imperial deficit, and despite realisation of Rs.30 crores instead of Rs.15 crores from 1920 loan, necessitated issue of Rs.32½ crores of notes against Treasury bills, besides Rs.18½ crores issued in accordance with the paper currency legislation in October last.

8. Ways and Means, 1921-22. Liabilities include Rs.15½ crores on account of 1921 war bonds; Rs.1½ crores on account of loans to Provincial Governments, and Rs.6½ crores on account of drawings of Local Governments on their balances. Further Rs.15 crores for Railway capital expenditure will be provided, and the Finance Member, although expecting criticism on inadequacy of sum, argued that it would be best in long run for the country, and indeed for the railways themselves, that the country should clear the ground for a future progressive policy by starting to free itself from short debt and other embarrassments caused by war. Finance Member was budgeting for a rupee loan in 1921 of only Rs.15 crores, and for a sterling loan of £5,000,000. Home charges will amount to about £46,000,000. No provision was being made for sale of Council Bills during the year. The Secretary of State possessed large sterling reserves, the transfer of which to India will keep him in funds for a long time. The Finance Member pointed out the importance of this fact on the future course of exchange.

9. In conclusion the Finance Member said he appreciated the disappointment of House at finding deficit so heavy as to involve taxation on such a scale, and he regretted that Assembly, at outset of its career, should be forced to face problems which might bring them some unpopularity in country, but by the courage and vision with which they confronted their present difficulties would they justify themselves to those who came after them.

India Office, S.W.,
1st March, 1921.

Tuesday, 22nd March, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

H.R.H. THE DUKE OF CONNAUGHT.

53. Colonel BURN asked the Prime Minister if it is the intention of His Majesty's Government to ask the House to express its appreciation and gratitude to Field-Marshal H.R.H. the Duke of Connaught for the admirable manner in which he has carried out in India the duties that were entrusted to him?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: The House feels, I am sure, both appreciation of the admirable manner in which His Royal Highness discharged his duties and gratitude to him for undertaking them; but it does not appear to me to be necessary to pass any Resolution in Parliament in order to give expression to what I believe to be the universal sentiment of the country.

Wednesday, 23rd March, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

SEDITION (PROSECUTIONS).

4. Colonel Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India how many persons have been prosecuted in India for seditious utterances in speeches or newspapers during the past three months, and how many have been convicted; and whether any prosecutions have been

instituted for incitement to assault and riot?

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Montagu): I regret that I have not the complete figures to enable me to reply fully to my hon. and gallant Friend. I have telegraphed for them, and will let him know as soon as I receive them.

BOLSHEVIK AGENTS.

9. Lieut.-Colonel Sir F. HALL asked the Secretary of State for India whether the terms of the trading agreement which has been entered into with Russia have been officially communicated to the Indian Government; and if he will state what action has been taken by that Government to ensure the expulsion from India of known Soviet agents?

Mr. MONTAGU: The answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. The Government of India instituted a special organisation to deal with Bolshevik activities in India, and although it would not be advisable to state what has actually been done, I can assure my hon. and gallant Friend that every step necessary to checkmate them has been taken, I trust, successfully.

Sir C. YATE: Is it not the fact that Mr. Gandhi lately stated that he preferred Bolshevik rule to British rule in India, and under these circumstances ought he not to be the first to be deported as a Soviet agent?

Mr. MONTAGU: I prefer to leave the maintenance of order in India to the authorities there.

INDIAN EMERGENCY COMMITTEE, LONDON.

10. Sir THOMAS BENNETT had given notice of the following Question—to ask the Secretary of State for India if he has received information from India concerning a Resolution reported to have been passed by all the non-official European members of the Council of State and the legislative assembly objecting to the formation in London of an Indian emergency committee as unnecessary and calculated to create prejudice and ill-feeling; and if he will furnish the House with a copy of the Resolution as well as with reports of the speeches lately delivered in India by His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught, in which appeals were made to all classes of the population to join in burying recent controversies?

Mr. MONTAGU: No, Sir, but I have seen a message from the non-official members of the Indian Legislature in the Press. I will place a copy of the proceedings at the opening of the Indian Legislature, including His Royal Highness's speech, in the Library.

Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS: Arising out of this question, may I ask your guidance, Mr. Speaker, as to whether it is in order for an hon. Member to put a question down reflecting, as it does, on a certain Committee, which consists of two Members of the other House, and one Member of this House, myself, and not appear in his place to ask it? I want to ask whether the question should not be deferred and not answered among the written answers until such time as the hon. Member chooses to come to the House and put it personally, so that I may put a supplementary question, or give a personal explanation?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member who put down the question may have been detained by an accident by flood or field.

Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS: With great deference, Sir, and in answer to that, may I ask whether a written answer may be postponed until the hon. Member who, of course, as you say, may have been detained by flood or field, can come down and put the question in open House so that it may be dealt with? As you, Sir, realise, the House adjourns to-morrow, and answers to unanswered questions—and I do not know what this answer may be—may be printed and contain reflection upon the Members of this Committee to which we have no possibility of replying?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is asking me to overrule the Order of the House, which is to the effect that if a question is not asked the answer should be circulated on the following day. Perhaps the best plan would be for the hon. Gentleman to see the answer, and if, then, if he is not satisfied, he can make a personal explanation to-morrow, or he can put a question to-morrow. I would accept a question on the subject.

Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS: Thank you, Sir.

OPIMUM CULTIVATION.

11. **Sir J. D. REES** asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the fact that there appears to be an extensive

recrudescence of the cultivation of the poppy in the provinces of Fukien and Yunnan, and that, as the result of the present disordered state of China, many other provinces are also drifting rapidly back to the state of things existing before the opium treaties, it is proposed to continue the opium policy pursued in India whereby the inhabitants of India suffer higher taxation and the inhabitants of China reap no advantage?

Mr. MONTAGU: It is not proposed to make any change in the opium policy of the Government of India as a result of the recrudescence of poppy cultivation in China. The matter is now governed by the Hague Convention; under that Convention, as China has prohibited the import of opium, India is bound to prevent the export of Indian opium to China.

Lieut. - Commander KENWORTHY: Would it not be easier for the Government of China, when they have re-established their powers, to suppress poppy cultivation in their own country than to suppress the import of opium from India if it is allowed to be started again?

Mr. MONTAGU: I do not think that that question arises. I have informed the House that there is no intention of altering the opium policy of the Government.

Lieut. - Commander KENWORTHY: Will the right. hon. Gentleman stand firm on this question, and not listen to the importunities of the opium trade on the subject?

Mr. MONTAGU: We are bound in the matter of our opium policy by The Hague Convention. Under that Convention so long as China prohibits the importation we cannot export to China.

Sir J. D. REES: Does the right hon. Gentleman realise that the prohibition of China of the import of opium is merely an empty form; whether the action of India is not affected by it; and is it not the case that this is one of the subjects now brought within the all-embracing programme of the League of Nations; does its decision override that of The Hague Convention in this particular matter?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am given to understand that the matter will be discussed by what is called the Opium Advisory Committee of the League of Nations at the forthcoming Congress in Geneva.

POLICE GRANT, BENGAL.

12. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India if he has any information regarding the reduction of the grant for police in the Bengal legislative council by 23 lakhs of rupees against the considered opinion of the Bengal Government; and what action he proposes to take in the matter?

16. **Mr. R. GWYNNE** asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Bengal legislative council have recently reduced the grant for police expenditure in the Province by 23 lakhs or more than one-eighth of the total grant demanded; and whether, in view of the unrest throughout India, steps can be taken to rectify this?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have no information beyond that which appeared in the Press on the 21st instant. I am inquiring as to the facts and action proposed by the Governor.

Sir C. YATE: In view of the fact that Bengal has a population of 50,000,000, and that there are only 3,000 or 4,000 troops in the whole Province, ought not the police of that province to be increased rather than decreased, especially now that law and order are at such a discount in the whole of India?

Mr. MONTAGU: I do not think it is at a discount. I am perfectly prepared to repose the completest confidence in Lord Ronaldshay and the Government of India.

Mr. R. GWYNNE: May we take it that the right hon. Gentleman will communicate with India on this matter?

Mr. MONTAGU: The hon. Gentleman knows that the restoration of this Vote is within the power of the Governor of Bengal and I have no knowledge of the facts except what has appeared in the Press. I have, however, inquired, and I will let the hon. Member know when I get the results of my communication. At the present time I prefer to leave the matter to the Governor of Bengal's discretion.

Mr. GWYNNE: Are we to understand that the right hon. Gentleman gets this information of first-rate importance from the Press first and not direct from India?

Mr. MONTAGU: As soon as I saw the report in the paper I sent a telegram to India to ascertain the facts. That is the first step we have taken. I am perfectly convinced that there is no difference of opinion between any Member of this House and the Governor of Bengal as to the absolute necessity of maintaining a sufficient number of police in Bengal to restore order.

Mr. GWYNNE: Will the right hon. Gentleman answer my question: Does he receive information of this kind first from the Press or does he get communications before those of the Press, direct from India?

Mr. MONTAGU: The first knowledge which I had of this event which, I think, occurred only a day or two ago was from the Press. The matter lies within the discretion of the Governor of Bengal. I presume in due course I shall hear from him what action has been taken. As a matter of fact I have had no communication yet from the Government of India as to this matter, and my first knowledge was derived from the Press.

Sir H. CRAIK: Is it not the duty of the Government of India to communicate to the Secretary of State for the information of this House any vital matters which ought not to be anticipated by Press reports?

Mr. MONTAGU: I wish my right hon. Friend would put himself in the place of the Governor of a Province. I cannot assume there is importance in a newspaper report which may relate to a perfectly simple matter. My right hon. Friend knows that the Governor has ample power under this Act. The report may relate to a matter which does not require a special communication to be made by telegram.

Sir H. BRITAIN: Is it not the fact that an up-to-date Press can beat an official Department in point of time?

DISTURBANCES, NAGPUR.

13. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India whether an outbreak occurred at Nagpur, in the Central

Provinces, on the 23rd February, when the Deputy Commissioner is said to have been stoned and wounded, and the civil surgeon seriously injured and his car smashed up by a mob of some 5,000 rioters who created a tumult in the city and broke into the District Court because two criminals had been arrested; and, if so, how it was that no communication on the subject has been issued to the Press; and whether, in view of the general anxiety in regard to the situation, he will take steps to issue a brief bulletin, daily if possible, summarising the news received from India for the information of Parliament and the public?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am circulating an account collected from a series of telegrams of the disturbance at Nagpur, from which I am glad to think it will be seen that it was not so serious as my hon. and gallant Friend's question would indicate. It is not always, I think, the best way to give an accurate picture of events in India to publish each telegram relating to such matters as it is received. I recognise the importance of furnishing the public with regular information about India and have been considering the best way of achieving it. I hope that a new organisation with this object in view will shortly be working. My Noble Friend Lord Lytton is taking the matter under his charge.

Sir C. YATE: Is it not the fact that all the British population in Nagpur had to be collected in the Armoury and kept there all night for protection? Is it right that the public of this country should have to await letters like that printed in the Press this morning for information as to what is going on in India?

Mr. MONTAGU: The information I have circulated is collated from telegrams I have received and it does not contain an account of that kind.

The following is the account promised:

The disturbances referred to arose out of the arrest of a prominent local resident on a charge of sedition. A large meeting of protest was held, and on the 23rd February there was a general abstention from work, which did not extend to the mills. On the next day the auction sales of liquor shops for the district were to be held at the District Courts. A large

crowd assembled to prevent the sales and assaulted one of the contractors. The police pressed the mob back to the city, where it dispersed. Two European officers and a few police constables were injured, but not seriously. In the city the mob again collected and looted several liquor shops, the police force being inadequate to control them. The same night another mass meeting was held with no serious consequences. A small force of troops were called in from the cantonment at Kamptee.

On the morning of the 25th everything was quiet and everybody at work. The District Magistrate, in the exercise of his ordinary powers, prohibited public meetings for one month. Notwithstanding this, an attempt was made to hold one, but the crowd dispersed quietly on learning that the meeting was prohibited. The sales, however, could not take place because the contractors were afraid to attend. The District Magistrate had an interview with the leaders of the Non-co-operation Movement, and warned them that the order prohibiting meetings would be enforced and that peace and order would be maintained by all the means at his disposal. The leaders undertook to use their influence to keep things quiet, but would give no guarantee. The Magistrate also prohibited persons entering the civil lines from the city without good reasons, fearing another demonstration at the courts during the hearing of a case in which a doctor was showing cause against an order prohibiting the picketing of liquor shops. That order has since been confirmed and made absolute for two months. The Governor of the Central Provinces sent a message to the Council regarding the disturbances, repudiating false statements about Government policy and stating that the Government would use all lawful and reasonable means to enforce authority by taking legal action against offenders. He invited the support of all responsible persons against the movement directed towards subverting the authority of the Government. My latest information, dated the 17th of this month, is that there has been no further trouble in Nagpur. It will be observed that the particulars of the disturbances as received by me do not bear out the alarming details given in the question, and it was because of this that it was not

considered necessary to make any special communication to the Press.

GERMANS, ADMISSION.

14. **Mr. CLOUGH** asked the Secretary of State for India what decision has been reached with regard to the return of German missionaries to India; and, in that case, what precautions will be taken to avoid a recurrence of political propaganda, particularly at the present time?

Mr. MONTAGU: In pursuance of the general policy of the Government of India and subject to exceptions only where that Government are satisfied that very special reasons to justify admission into India exist, Germans, of whatever occupation, are excluded from India for a period of five years from the conclusion of the War. The second part of the question therefore does not arise.

ARMY ORGANISATION.

15. **Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he can now make his promised statement on the position of the Army in India?

Mr. MONTAGU: The Prime Minister has decided on my recommendation to submit the military requirements of India to a Sub-Committee of the Committee of Imperial Defence. While it is obviously desirable to secure reductions in military expenditure in India as in other parts of the world, they can only be achieved if compatible with the internal and external security of India. It therefore appears desirable that such an investigation should take into consideration improvements in equipment, mobility and general efficiency. The Government of India have announced that they are appointing a committee of the Viceroy's Executive Council to prepare the material to lay before the Committee of Imperial Defence.

Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS: Arising out of this very important statement, may I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the late Commander-in-Chief (Sir Charles Monro) will be added to the Sub-Committee of Imperial Defence, and whether, pending the decision of the Committee of Imperial Defence, no further reductions will take place in the Indian Army?

Mr. MONTAGU: I can give an assurance that no further reductions will be

made pending the inquiry. The first part of the question should, I think, be addressed to the Prime Minister, who will appoint the Committee, but I cannot conceive that such an inquiry will proceed far with its investigation without availing itself of the opinions of the gallant soldier, to whom the hon. Member has referred, and to whom also the Army in India owes so much.

Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS: May I ask whether the Committee of Imperial Defence will have power to suggest to the Government of India—if it sees fit—that the alterations already made in the Indian Army should be cancelled?

Mr. MONTAGU: Certainly. What we want to arrive at is a scientific investigation of what is necessary in the present circumstances for the internal and external security of India. These are the only considerations which can govern the Indian Army.

Lieut.-Colonel FREMANTLE: Will the Sub-Committee of Imperial Defence have anyone on it who is qualified and able to deal with the extremely difficult question of the health of the Indian Army?

Mr. MONTAGU: The inquiry will deal with the strength of the army in India. I respectfully suggest that questions as to the composition of the Committee should be addressed to the Prime Minister.

Sir C. YATE: Is it not the fact that the first action of the Reformed Councils in India was to pass resolutions entailing a heavy reduction of the Indian Army and police and a curtailment of propaganda? Is this to be allowed to proceed?

Mr. MONTAGU: I would prefer to answer that question on a specific reference to the particular resolution. I do not know what the hon. and gallant Member has in his mind. The Legislative Assembly of India has passed a resolution on the Esher Report, but the best evidence of its determination to provide for the defence of the country is to be found in the alacrity with which it has passed the heavy Budget provision necessary for the Army.

Sir C. YATE: May I —

Mr. SPEAKER: Notice had better be given of any further questions.

CONSPIRACY CONVICTIONS (PARDONS).

17. **Mr. R. GWYNNE** asked the Secretary of State for India if Mr. Harkishan Lal and others, convicted of conspiracy to wage war, and sentenced to transportation for life by three Judges, appealed against the convictions and sentences to the Privy Council; whether they were pardoned by the Executive while their appeals were pending, though similar appeals from others had been dismissed by the Privy Council; and, if so, what was the special reason why these appeals should not have been allowed to run their course?

Mr. MONTAGU: The answer to the first two parts of the question is in the affirmative, though it is not the case, as the question implies, that the grant or refusal of pardons was determined by probabilities of the justice or legality of the convictions. As regards the last part, I do not know the reasons which have actuated appellants who have decided not to prosecute their appeals.

Mr. GWYNNE: Will the right hon. Gentleman say why these cases were taken out of the usual course?

Mr. MONTAGU: I do not think they were taken out of the ordinary course. There was an appeal pending which the appellant did not choose to prosecute, and meanwhile the Viceroy granted a pardon to certain people.

Sir C. YATE: Was it not rather that an amnesty was granted before the appeal came on?

Mr. MONTAGU: Yes, I think so. I surmise that this is what happened: One of these appeals founded on the question of the legality of the Courts which were set up in India was dismissed by the Privy Council—not the question of what happened, but on the question of legality—and therefore I presume that the other appellants did not think it worth while to go on.

Mr. GWYNNE: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that two days before the new rules in regard to the Legislative Councils were before the House he told me that none of the persons who were convicted and sentenced would be eligible for them for five years, and yet, in spite of that, one of the convicted persons has been appointed a Minister?

Mr. MONTAGU: I think the hon. Member will find that all the information I have given to the House is accurate.

Mr. GWYNNE: But—

Mr. SPEAKER: Further questions must be put down.

GOVERNMENT NEWSPAPER.

18. **Mr. JAMES BELL** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that a Government newspaper, the "Myanma Traineryo Thadinsa," is now issued by the Publicity Bureau, Burma; and whether he will consider the desirability of not allowing officials to establish newspapers at the public expense in order to propagate their views?

Mr. MONTAGU: Yes, Sir. A Government newspaper called "Nyanma Taing-kyo Thadinsa" is now issued by the Publicity Bureau of the Government of Burma, the first number having appeared on the 9th February. It is most desirable that steps should be taken to disseminate accurate information and expose the false information which is unfortunately being so widely disseminated in India. There are obvious advantages in doing this through the public Press, but I do not propose to interfere.

Mr. SHORT: What expense is attached to the publication of this paper?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am afraid I cannot say without notice, but if a question be put down I will inquire.

Mr. WATERSON: Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the desirability of putting copies of the paper in the Library, for the information of hon. Members?

Mr. MONTAGU: I think I can get copies if desired.

Sir H. CRAIK: Was not evidence laid before the Joint Committee expressly urging that such steps as these should be taken by the Government?

Mr. MONTAGU: I think everybody who knows anything about the present condition of India will agree it is absolutely essential that silly rumours and false information should be contradicted by authoritative information, and the Joint Committee's Report was most valuable in stimulating this action.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

SANDHURST CADETS.

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India how many Sandhurst cadets have stated their wish to enter the Indian Army in their last term at the Royal Military College since the date of the Armistice; how many of these were King's India cadets; and how many Indian Army appointments were announced at the time of the entrance examinations?

Mr. MONTAGU: Since the date of the Armistice 98 Sandhurst Cadets have joined the Indian Army, excluding those who entered for Quetta, but were trained at Sandhurst. Sixteen of these were King's India Cadets. The entrance examinations at which these 98 Cadets entered were held in November, 1917, March, July and November, 1918, and at these four examinations 95 Indian Army appointments were offered. In the last passing out list out of the first 17 in order of merit 10 were candidates for the Indian Army of whom 4 were Quetta Cadets.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Captain TUDOR-REES asked the Secretary of State for India whether and, if so, why the Secretary to the Government of India in the Public Works Department is being paid a lower salary than that common to all other Secretaries in the Civil Secretariat of that Government?

Mr. MONTAGU: The pay of the Secretary to the Government of India in the Public Works Department was fixed in 1905 at Rs. 3500 per mensem it being considered that the pay of the appointment should be fixed with reference to the rate of pay drawn by Chief Engineers in the Public Works Department and Secretaries to local Governments and not with reference to what was drawn by other Secretaries to the Government of India. On the recommendation of the Government of India and in view of the revision of the pay of the Public Works Department as a whole, I have recently sanctioned an increase in the pay of this appointment to Rs. 3750 per mensem.

Captain TUDOR-REES asked the Secretary of State for India whether he has

received a memorial from the officers of the Public Works Department asking for an improvement in their rates of pay; and, if so, whether he proposes to take any and, if so, what action in the matter?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am aware that such a memorial is being submitted to me through the Government of India. As soon as it reaches me with the recommendations of that Government, it will receive my careful consideration in Council.

RAILWAY AND INLAND WATER TRAFFIC (SURCHARGE).

Mr. A. SHAW asked the Secretary of State for India whether the increased surcharge on railway and on water-borne inland traffic has any connection with the financial position of the railways; whether the Finance Member stated on the 1st March that the net income from railways was decreasing and that it was proposed as a temporary measure to increase the present surcharge; and what, if any, is the relation between the railway position and this surcharge?

Mr. MONTAGU: The temporary increase of the surcharge on railway and inland steamer traffic is one of a number of measures for providing the additional revenue required to balance the Indian Budget of 1921-2. It has no direct relation to the decrease in the net income from railways which, in turn, is only one of the reasons necessitating the provision of additional revenue.

RAILWAY STATION, GUJRANWALLA.

Colonel WEDGWOOD asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that the railway station at Gujranwalla is being moved some two miles away from the town and the present station, and that this change of position is alleged to be due to a desire to punish the town for riots which took place there two years ago; and will he inquire into this matter?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have no information on the subject, but will make inquiry of the Government of India.

DR. KITCHLEW AND MR. RAMBHAJ DUTT.

Colonel WEDGWOOD asked the Secretary of State for India whether, and, if so, why, Dr. Kitchlew and Rambhaji Dutt Chandry have been put in prison?

Mr. MONTAGU: In a telegram dated 7th March the Government of India informed me that, in consequence of violent speeches delivered at Lyallpur, Rupar and elsewhere, orders have been issued under the Defence of India Act requiring Mr. Rambhaji Dutt and Dr. Kitchlew to abstain from attending or addressing any public meeting in the province. It is clear, therefore, that at that time these men were not in prison. I have no later information.

TRANSBORDER RAIDS AND DACOITIES.

Colonel WEDGWOOD asked the Secretary of State for India how many Pathan raids there have been into the north-west frontier province of India in the six months ending 28th February last; how many persons have been refused a licence to carry arms in the same province in the same period; and will he give the same figures for the Campbellpur district of the Punjab?

Mr. MONTAGU: In the five months up to the end of January there have been 174 transborder raids and dacoities in the province. I do not know if Pathans were the perpetrators in each case, and I have no figures for February. As to the rest of the question, I regret that I have no information.

PRISON SYSTEM, ANDAMANS.

Colonel WEDGWOOD asked the Secretary of State for India if and when the Report of the prison system in the Andamans will be published?

Mr. MONTAGU: The Report was published in India on the 10th March. I propose to present it to Parliament and to publish it in this country as soon as sufficient copies are received from India. These are now on their way. Meanwhile, I will have copies placed in the Libraries of both Houses, together with a short summary of the principal recommendations of the Indian Jails Committee and of the action taken thereon.

MOUNTED OFFICERS (CHARGERS).

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether, considering that the Esher Committee Report recommended the adoption in India of the system in force at home whereby mounted officers are provided with chargers by Government, which also pays for their upkeep, he will impress upon the Government of India the desirability of carry-

ing out this recommendation in full and not limiting it by simply permitting mounted officers in India to purchase chargers at concessional rates?

Mr. MONTAGU: The Committee's recommendation has been carefully considered by the Government of India, but in view of other pressing military requirements of the present time they were unable to accept it in full. There would, moreover, be complications in a country where many stations are so distant from Remount Depots, in the care and disposal of Government horses when officers proceed home on leave. It was also considered that if the horses were the property of officers themselves, they would probably be better cared for.

Thursday, 24th March, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

SUTLEJ RIVER HYDRO-ELECTRIC SCHEME.

Mr. LYLE asked the Secretary of State for India the estimated cost of the Sutlej River hydro-electric scheme, indicating the anticipated outlay per yard of tunnel bored; and whether the attention of the Indian Government has been called to the latest developments in tunnelling apparatus which greatly cheapen the outlay?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have no information as to the estimated cost of the Sutlej River hydro-electric scheme. I will communicate the hon. Member's question to the Government of India.

CIVIL SERVICE.

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India what steps have been taken to give the Indian Civil Services sliding scales of bonuses in proportion to the index figure of prices, the same as has been given to all classes of civil servants at Home, to meet the extra cost of living?

Mr. MONTAGU: No such steps have been taken. The particular expedient indicated by the hon. and gallant Member was carefully considered, and found to be impracticable. But the pay of the services in question has been permanently raised, and in fixing the extent of the increase sanctioned regard was had, *inter alia*, to the rise in the cost of living.

Sir T. BENNETT asked the Secretary of State for India whether numerous memorials have been received from members of the Indian Civil Service in the Bombay Presidency, supported by the Government of Bombay, praying for a refund of the four per cent. contribution levied under Article 556 of the Civil Service Regulation with full retrospective effect, instead of with effect only from 1st April, 1919; whether similar representations have been received from a committee of retired members of the Indian Civil Service; whether the Secretary of State proposes to reconsider the whole position, in view of the effect on recruitment and on the working of the reforms scheme, of a decision which penalises the older men for the benefit of the younger, nullifies the policy of cheap encouragement for recruiting by discouraging retirements, and deferring indefinitely the normal promotion of young officers to posts of responsibility, and makes no adequate provision for the improvement of a pension system condemned in 1914 as inadequate for all, and peculiarly so for those retiring from high positions?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am considering, in consultation with the Government of India, whether there is any ground for modifying the decision already reached in this matter.

ARMY OFFICERS (EXCHANGE COMPENSATION ALLOWANCE).

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether exchange compensation allowance will be granted to officers serving in India when the exchange value of the rupee falls below 1s. 4d.?

Mr. MONTAGU: I understand the grant of exchange compensation allowance has been revised in India owing to the fall in the exchange value of the rupee. I have inquired, but have not yet received full information, as to the officers to whom and the conditions on which this grant is now being made. On receipt of this information I will communicate with the hon. and gallant Member.

IMPORT DUTIES.

Sir W. de FRECE asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in addition to the increased duty on cotton goods, the Indian Government has introduced any other increased duties on merchandise

especially supplied from this country; and in that case, what they are?

Mr. MONTAGU: The great majority of India's imports have been subjected to increased duties. The increase in the general rate of duty from $7\frac{1}{2}$ to 11 per cent. *ad valorem* affects woollen and linen manufactures as well as cotton goods, apparel, chemicals, drugs and medicines, hardware and cutlery, most kinds of instruments and apparatus, paper and pasteboard, dyes, paints and colours, soap, etc. The $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. duty levied on motor cars and cycles, bicycles, etc., clocks and watches, musical instruments, silk goods and other articles of luxury has been increased to 20 per cent. The duties on beer, spirits and tobacco have also been raised, and machinery and stores for cotton mills, which have hitherto been duty free, will in future pay $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. On the other hand, the $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. duties levied on most descriptions of iron and steel, machinery and railway material have not been enhanced.

OUDH AND ROHILKUND RAILWAY (UPPER SUBORDINATES).

Captain BOWYER asked the Secretary of State for India whether he will explain why it is that all the State railways of India have been re-rated except the Oudh and Rohilkund; and will he give definite orders to the Railway Board to put the upper subordinates of the Oudh and Rohilkund Railway on the same rates of pay as those of the Bombay, Baroda, and Central India Railway?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am not aware that the upper subordinates on the Oudh and Rohilkund Railway have been treated differently from those on other State railways in the matter of increase of pay, but I will send an inquiry to the Government of India on the subject.

Tuesday, 5th April, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

ARMY (CONSTITUTION AND STRENGTH).

46. **Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS** asked the Prime Minister to state the composition

of the Sub-Committee of Imperial Defence to report upon the constitution and strength of the Army in India?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: A Sub-Committee of the Committee of Imperial Defence has not been specially appointed to consider the constitution and strength of the Army in India.

Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS: Did we not have a pledge from the Secretary of State for India, and was I not asked to put this question to the Prime Minister?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: I am afraid I am not in a position to make an explanation. This matter has not come under the consideration of the Imperial Defence Committee, and up to the present no sub-Committee has been appointed, and I cannot definitely say whether a sub-Committee will be appointed. It may be that a Committee of the Imperial Defence Committee will consider it.

Lieut.-Colonel CROFT: Will the Cabinet consider the whole question before proceeding to the disbandment of regiments of the Regular Army in this country and the great reduction of regiments in India? Before any final steps are taken will they consider the question as a whole?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: The Cabinet does consider the defence of the Empire as a whole.

Lieut.-Colonel CROFT: Has the question been before the Defence Committee?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: I should not like to say without notice. I think not by the Committee of Imperial Defence. I think it was considered by the Cabinet as a whole.

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE.

Colonel WEDGWOOD (*by Private Notice*) asked the Secretary of State for India why the delegates recommended by the All India Trades Union Congress have not been selected by the Government to go to the International Labour Conference at Geneva?

Lieut.-Commander YOUNG: I have been asked to reply to this question. My right hon. Friend has no information on the subject, but will inquire.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

GOVERNMENT SERVICE (CONTRACTS).

Mr. T. GRIFFITHS asked the Secretary of State for India whether under the new Reform Act now in force, whereby absolute control over finance and appointments over a wide area of government is given to the various Indian provincial councils and their elective majorities, a British-born subject can now sue for breach of contract for personal service in India; if so, whom he should sue and where for a breach in India or for a breach in this country; whether such subject will now have the right to know the medical grounds, should the India Office Medical Board certify him incapacitated for further service in India; whether such contracts will be still deemed subject to the will and pleasure of the Crown; what authority or powers over such contracts is it contemplated transferring to the independent high commissioners who will represent the various Indian governments; and whether such actions as Dr. Denning recently attempted to bring will be outside the domain of the British Government?

Mr. MONTAGU: As regards the first part of the question, the new Act in no way affects the pre-existing right of a British-born subject to sue for breach of contract for personal service in India. As regards the second part, contracts for service under the Government of India are made with "the Secretary of State in Council." Such subject would presumably sue the Secretary of State in Council in respect of a breach either in India or in this country. The action could be brought in this country or in India according to circumstances. As regards the third part, the position will remain unaltered, in so far as an officer certified by the India Office Medical Board to be incapacitated for further service in India is not regarded as necessarily entitled to know the medical grounds on which such a certificate is given. As regards the fourth part such contracts are not subject to the will and pleasure of the Crown, except that, as stated in answer to the hon. Member's question on 2nd March, the Crown has in law the right to dispense with the services of its officers, and it would not be

in the power of the Secretary of State in Council or of a government in India to alter the law in this respect or to limit this right of the Crown when entering into such contracts. As regards the fifth part, the Secretary of State in Council will remain the authority for the recruitment of those services which are now known as "all-India services"—such as the Indian Civil Service, the superior police service, the Indian educational service, and so forth, and consequently will remain the contracting party for these. Recruitment in this country of services, the members of which are now to be appointed and controlled by provincial governments, will probably be made over for the most part to the High Commissioner for India, and he would necessarily, subject to instructions he receives from the authorities in India for whom he is acting, have power to contract on their behalf, but in the name of the Secretary of State in Council. The answer to the last part of the question, if I correctly understand the hon. Member's meaning, is therefore that it will still be open to officers like Dr. Denning to sue the Secretary of State in Council.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT (TECHNICAL ALLOWANCE).

Sir T. BENNETT asked the Secretary of State for India if he has yet received from the Government of India a number of memorials from members of the Public Works Department, recruited in India, on the subject of the technical allowance, with the comments and opinions of the Government thereon; and if he has come to a decision on the matter?

Mr. MONTAGU: No, Sir, but I have recently received information from the Government of India that I may expect them shortly.

Wednesday, 6th April, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

BOLSHEVIK ROUBLE NOTES.

4. **Sir J. D. REES** asked the Secretary of State for India whether the possession of Bolshevik money has been made illegal in British India?

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Montagu): The possession of any rouble notes in India was made illegal by ordinance in 1919 and 1920, and the operation of the ordinance was continued by Act No. XXX. of the latter year.

Sir J. D. REES: Is the right hon. Gentleman in a position to recommend the Government at home to pass a like ordinance or law?

Lieut.-Commander KENWORTHY: In view of the trading agreement which has been signed with Russia, will this Regulation be released in regard to *bonâ fide* merchants trading with Russia?

Mr. MONTAGU: I think that would depend upon whether we have evidence of a cessation of Bolshevik propaganda in India.

ARMY.

5. **Sir J. D. REES** asked the Secretary of State for India whether the main and fundamental recommendations of the Esher Committee have yet come before His Majesty's Government after consideration by himself in Council?

Mr. MONTAGU: The answer is in the negative.

7. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Army in India has already been reduced by 6,000 British and 7,500 Indian troops under pre-War strength; and, if so, whether the safety of carrying out such large reductions in the Army in the face of the agitation and unrest now rampant in India has been considered?

Mr. MONTAGU: The present proposals of the Government of India, if they are eventually sanctioned, will have the effect of reducing the fighting units of the Army in India approximately to the extent mentioned by my hon. and gallant Friend. The proposals have been made by the Government of India on the recommendation of the Commander-in-Chief, after full consideration of all the factors in the situation, of which not the least important is the improved mobility and equipment of the Army in such matters, for instance, as the establishment of the Air Force and the provision of armoured cars, which to a large extent compensates for the reduction in personnel. As my hon. and gallant Friend

is aware, the whole question is to be considered by a sub-committee of the Committee of Imperial Defence.

Sir C. YATE: Are we to understand that these reductions have already been carried out?

Mr. MONTAGU: It is not accurate to say that the reduction in the British forces has been sanctioned; what has occurred is that a considerable number of British forces in India left India for War purposes and have not yet returned.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: Can the right hon. Gentleman say whether the agitation and unrest now rampant in India would not be more speedily reduced by cutting down expenditure rather than by the keeping up of unnecessary expenditure at a time of such great economic trouble in India?

Mr. MONTAGU: I do not think that anyone wants unnecessary expenditure, but what we are determined to see is that the armed forces of the Crown in India are adequate for the protection of India.

AFGHANISTAN NEGOTIATIONS.

6. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India if he can give any information regarding the negotiations with Afghanistan now being carried on at Kabul.

Mr. MONTAGU: The negotiations, which have as their object the conclusion of a treaty of friendship, are proceeding. I am not at present in a position to make any further statement.

WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY.

8. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India who is the present Director of Wireless Telegraphy in India; whether the wireless expert to the Government of India, originally sent out from home, has since resigned, on appointment as director of the Marconi Company; whether the wireless system in India required for military purposes is complete; if not, what steps are being taken to make it so; and whether the complaints in the Indian Press as to the unsatisfactory condition of commercial wireless are justified.

Mr. MONTAGU: Colonel A. Simpson, who was appointed Director of Wireless Telegraphy in India in 1919, resigned last year, and subsequently joined the Board

of the Marconi Company. In his place I have appointed Commander R. L. Nicholson, D.S.O., late R.N., who is leaving for India next week. So far as I am aware, the wireless system in India required for military purposes is complete as regards internal communication. The complaint as to the unsatisfactory condition of commercial wireless, to which the hon. and gallant Member probably refers, is too vague for me to say whether it is justified.

BURMA (CUSTOM OF SHIKHO).

9. **Colonel WEDGWOOD** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he will call for a Report on the habit of shikho as performed in Burma, finding out what is thought of this custom both by British officials and educated Burmese, with a view to introducing into Burma methods less redolent of an oriental theocratic monarchy of the pre-Christian era?

Mr. MONTAGU: The custom of shikho, according to the best of my information, is an observance or mark of respect incidental to religion as well as to etiquette among Burmans. It would be contrary to the policy definitely laid down in 1858, and consistently followed since, for the Government to attempt to change the usage.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that there is a number of British officials in Burma who are so disgusted with the habit that they will not allow it to be done to them?

Mr. MONTAGU: No; I am not aware of that.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: Will the right hon. Gentleman make inquiries about this custom, which is causing great unrest in Burma at the present time?

Mr. MONTAGU: I will bring my hon. and gallant Friend's question to the notice of the Government of India.

VICEROY (TITLE).

10. **Colonel WEDGWOOD** asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in deference to the demand from Burma, any steps are being taken to change the style and title of the Viceroy to Governor-General of India and Burma?

Mr. MONTAGU: This matter will, I hope, be considered in connection with the Government of Burma Bill. I would refer

[Mr. Montagu.]

the hon. and gallant Member to the recently published correspondence on Constitutional Reform in Burma which shows my hope that the change may be effected.

Sir C. YATE: Will the question as to the separation of Burma from India be considered?

Mr. MONTAGU: Yes.

RIOTS AND CASUALTIES.

12. Captain Viscount CURZON asked the Secretary of State for India how many riots and disturbances have occurred in India since the 1st of March; what number of casualties have resulted to the civil population and to the servants of the Crown; how many of such outbreaks have been due to the influence of Gandhi or his policy; in cases where the outbreaks were not due to his influence or action, if he will state what causes they were due; and whether the rebels tried subsequently to take advantage of the situation.

Mr. MONTAGU: I have received reports of ten riots and disturbances during March. In six of them there were no casualties reported. In one tea garden riot some persons attacked were injured, not seriously; and in a faction fight in Southern India one person was killed. In the remaining two cases 13 rioters were killed and 25 wounded by police fire, and some police were injured, not seriously, the number not being given. It is very difficult to assign one definite cause, for there are usually contributing factors, but three of the disturbances were of the nature of labour troubles, and three of religious disputes; one arose from agrarian grievances and in one prisoners broke out from jail. The other two were brought on by a strong agitation against liquor shops, which is ascribed in part to a genuine temperance movement and in part to the general non co-operation programme. I have no doubt that attempts were made by ill-disposed persons to take advantage of the situation.

Sir C. YATE: Is it not a fact that most of these riots were owing to political agitators and the agitation got up by them?

Mr. MONTAGU: I do not think that my hon. and gallant Friend would

ascribe the disturbances to anything but agrarian causes.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: Will the right hon. Gentleman get, or has he got any report on the shooting at Majpur that he can communicate to the House?

Mr. MONTAGU: I think—I speak from memory, because my hon. and gallant Friend has not given me notice of the question—that *communiqués*, based on every telegram I have received, have already been published; but if there is anything further, I will communicate with the hon. Member.

Sir C. YATE: Were not the Rae Bareli riots primarily due to political agitators?

Mr. MONTAGU: I think I am right in saying that the Rae Bareli riots were due entirely to agrarian causes.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

HIGH COURT CASES (SOLICITORS).

Mr. T. GRIFFITHS asked the Secretary of State for India why the India Office, in *Denning v. Secretary of State for India*, instructed an outside firm of solicitors, who were not official solicitors in the sense of being Government employés; and whether this course resulted in a needless additional cost in resisting the plaintiff's claim?

Mr. MONTAGU: It would be necessary to increase the India Office legal staff to enable it to conduct cases in the High Court, but the number of such cases in which the Office is concerned is so small that the increase would not be justified, and it is more economical to employ outside solicitors to deal with any which occur. Moreover, the majority of cases are concerned with technical subjects, such as patents, in which it would, in any case, be necessary to employ firms specially qualified to deal with them. The answer to the second part of the question is, therefore, in the negative.

BURMA.

Mr. MACQUISTEN asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that the Indian Government

collects a large revenue from Burma which it does not expend in Burma but devotes to general Indian purposes, with the result that the resources of Burma are very imperfectly developed, both as regards roads and railways and land development, which are not only not fostered, but rather retarded by the Indian Government; and whether he will consider severing the connection between India and Burma and creating the latter a Crown Colony, with a view to its better development and a juster expenditure of its revenue on Burmese development?

Mr. MONTAGU: I think that the first part of the hon. Member's question overlooks the radical alteration which has been made on the recommendation of Lord Meston's Committee, by the rules under the Government of India Act for the apportionment of revenues between the Government of India and the provinces. As regards the second part of the question, I hope that the whole question of Burma's constitutional future will be examined shortly by the Standing Joint Committee on Indian affairs.

CAVALRY AND INFANTRY REGIMENTS.

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India how many regiments of Indian cavalry and infantry have already been disbanded; and how many more are in course of reduction?

Mr. MONTAGU: Up to 24th February of this year three Indian cavalry regiments, the 5th additional squadrons of four Indian cavalry regiments, and 53 infantry and pioneer battalions had been disbanded. None of the above were pre-War units. Further reductions, and in the case of cavalry, amalgamation of regiments which are no longer required for service overseas, will take place as opportunity offers on their return to India. But, as I stated in this House on the 23rd March, no further reduction beyond that already announced, of the post-War establishment proposed for Indian purposes will be made pending consideration of the whole question by the Sub-committee of the Committee of Imperial Defence.

GOVERNMENT SERVICE (CONTRACTS).

Mr. SPOOR asked the Secretary of State for India whether the main difference in the new and old forms of

contract for service in India is to make it clear that the officer serves at the will and pleasure of the Crown, but that the new form of contract contains no provision safeguarding a civil servant against injustice through departmental blunders; and whether he will consider the advisability of arranging for future cases of dispute to be referred to an independent tribunal, and so avoid departmental mistakes inadvertently ruining the careers of able men and losing their services to the Indian Empire?

Mr. MONTAGU: The relevant point of difference between the present form of contract and that which was in use in 1909 is that the present form states explicitly a condition, which in the earlier form was contained by reference to the Civil Service Regulations, namely, that service may be determined by reason of medical unfitness on the report of a duly constituted advisory medical board. I do not understand the hon. Member's references to departmental blunders and mistakes, and do not consider it necessary to insert any provision purporting to safeguard a civil servant against their occurrence, nor to take the action suggested in the second part of the question.

Mr. R. RICHARDSON asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that the new form of India Office contract of service is open to the strictures passed by a judge on the form of contract relied upon by the plaintiff in *Denning v. Secretary of State for India*; whether he contemplates amending Clause 6 with its provision for dismissal without notice in the event of misconduct, seeing that the learned judge considered it unnecessary, as the contract was liable to be determined at the pleasure of the Crown; what is the object of the provision as to the taking of evidence in the event of an action of legal proceedings between the parties, seeing that the learned judge considered such Clause misleading since its implication was that proceedings would lie against the Secretary of State; whether Clause 10 in the new form of contract is open to the same objection as Clause 9 in the old form, namely, of indicating that service can only be determined by three calendar months' notice before the expiration of the agreement period; whether his attention has been drawn to the Attorney-

General's assurance that the learned judge's remarks should receive every attention and respect; whether, in view of the learned judge's observations that the general form of these contracts was most unfortunate and misleading and contradictory to the Crown's common law right to determine the contract at any time without notice, he will consider the advisability of having the new form of contract revised and a draft submitted to one of His Majesty's judges for criticism before its final adoption; whether, in view of the Crown's power of dismissal at pleasure, such contracts will henceforth be known as memoranda of engagement and not agreements; whether he will consider the insertion of a fresh Clause, calling attention to the Crown's present power of dismissal at pleasure and at the same time safeguarding the interests of the civilian signatory against injustice through departmental blunders; and whether he will consider the advisability of arranging for civil servants with expired contracts having the right of reference to an independent tribunal?

Mr. MONTAGU: As regards the first, fifth, sixth, and eighth parts of the question the learned judge in the case referred to criticised the form of the contract made with Dr. Denning as misleading, and the Attorney-General gave an assurance that the judge's remarks would receive every attention; the present form of contract differs from the old in stating more explicitly that service may be terminated on account of medical unfitness, but I am aware that the present form does not wholly meet the judge's criticism in so far as it makes no reference to the Crown's common law right to determine an officer's service at pleasure. I am advised that it is so well established by previous cases as to be sufficiently well known that persons in the Civil Service of the Crown hold office during His Majesty's pleasure, and a declaration to this effect is now included in the Government of India Act; it should consequently be well known that the Crown has the legal right, however infrequently exercised, to dispense with its officers' services, but I am considering whether a reference to this right of the Crown should be inserted in the form of contract; it would not, I think, be desirable to refer the question to one of His Majesty's judges who cannot properly

be asked to share in the responsibility for an executive decision; I do not understand the reference to departmental blunders and do not consider it necessary to insert a provision purporting to safeguard officers from injustice arising from such a source. As regards the second and fourth parts of the question, it is, I think, agreed that any amendment of the form of contract should be in the direction of making it more explicit rather than the reverse; I do not therefore contemplate amending Clause 6, which already contains specific provision for dismissal in certain circumstances; the learned judge's criticisms of certain clauses were based on the absence of any accompanying clause referring explicitly to the Crown's common law right of dismissal, and (whether or not it is found practicable to insert such a clause) it is clearly desirable to retain the existing specific conditions as to notice and dismissal, otherwise the Crown would have to rely generally on its common law right, which is exactly the opposite of what both the hon. Member and I myself desire. As regards the third part of the question I am advised that it is desirable to retain the concluding clause of the form of contract which contains provisions as to the giving of evidence; other actions besides actions for wrongful dismissal might be brought in respect of the agreements. As regards the seventh part of the question I do not see the need of the change of nomenclature suggested. The answer to the last part is in the negative.

Mr. T. GRIFFITHS asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that in *Denning v. the Secretary of State for India* the plaintiff, formerly Superintendent of Industries, Bengal, contended that the medical evidence upon which his contract of service had been prematurely terminated was wrong in fact and false in deduction; that Dr. Denning has been consistently refused any opportunity of rebutting the India Office Medical Board's verdict that he was incapacitated for further service in India; that, when communicating the Board's verdict, the Deputy - Accountant - General suggested that Dr. Denning should apply for permission to retire from the service of the Government; that Dr. Denning acknowledged, expressing his readiness to resume his duties, and inquiring whether the Medical Board ascribed his alleged in-

capacity for further service to cardiac defect; that to this inquiry the Under-Secretary replied that it was not in accordance with the practice of the India Office to give the information asked for; that thereupon Dr. Denning declined to send in his resignation; that the Under-Secretary subsequently notified him that his service under the Government had terminated; that Dr. Denning then challenged the propriety of this summary dismissal, in view of his special contract, and at the same time stated that he had taken the opinion of eminent medical men, and held a written certificate that he was in as good health then as previous to his departure for India; that, despite frequent applications for details of the India Office Medical Board's verdict, it was not until he had started proceedings for breach of contract and of wrongful dismissal, and the defence was delivered, that the India Office medical particulars were disclosed; that the particulars then disclosed stated that after an attack of malaria Dr. Denning developed a mitral systolic murmur audible round his axilla, whereas this condition was consequent on rheumatic fever at the age of 14, was present when he was passed for service in India, and that an eminent Harley Street heart specialist considered the valve leakage so slight that the heart is not embarrassed in its work and the functional efficiency not impaired; that for practical purposes the heart is sound, not liable to failure, and Dr. Denning is fit for any occupation; and, in view of the unsatisfactory medical position, will he consider the advisability of Dr. Denning's case even now being gone into further, with the object of his receiving adequate compensation for the loss of income sustained through the India Office handling of his case and the consequent damage to his future prospects?

Mr. MONTAGU: The facts recited in the first nine parts of the question are substantially correct, except that I cannot accept the description of the termination of Dr. Denning's services as a "Summary dismissal." As regards the tenth and eleventh parts, it was stated in the defence that Dr. Denning suffered from malarial fever in India and developed a mitral systolic murmur; Dr. Denning alleged in his reply that this condition was present in 1909 when he was passed for service in India by the India Office

Medical Board and that it was, or could have been, known by the medical board; if Dr. Denning's present allegation is correct, it is difficult to reconcile it with the fact that in 1909 he signed a specific declaration that to the best of his knowledge and belief he was not affected with any form of disease such as disease of the heart and that he would fully reveal to the medical board all circumstances within his knowledge that concerned his health. I cannot enter now into questions which are matter for expert medical opinion; the medical board which examined Dr. Denning were the responsible medical advisers of the Secretary of State in Council and being possessed of Indian experience were best qualified to judge of the degree of medical unfitness that would prevent an officer performing efficiently trying duties in the peculiar conditions of service in India. The answer to the last part of the question is in the negative.

Thursday, 7th April, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

IMPERIAL DEFENCE.

CAVALRY REDUCTIONS (GREAT BRITAIN AND INDIA).

33. Lieut.-Colonel CROFT asked the Prime Minister whether the Imperial Defence Committee met and gave full considerations to the reductions in the cavalry of the United Kingdom and India, involving the disbanding in all of 67 cavalry regiments, before deciding to disband the four Regular and 45 Yeomanry regiments in the United Kingdom?

The PRIME MINISTER: The answer is in the negative. The responsibility for these reductions must be taken by the Government and by Parliament.

Lieut.-Colonel CROFT: Was the reduction of the Indian cavalry regiments settled in the first place in this country? Is the whole defensive position of the Empire being considered in this connection? So long as the vast majority of the British Army are in Mesopotamia, on the Rhine, and in Palestine, does the

[Lieut.-Colonel Croft.]
right hon. Gentleman not consider that the question of disbanding four cavalry regiments in this country should be delayed until some of the troops have returned to this country?

The PRIME MINISTER: The hon. and gallant Member is raising very big issues, which have been discussed at considerable length here, and I do not think that by question and answer I can possibly deal with the subject.

Lieut.-Colonel CROFT: Will the right hon. Gentleman consider my suggestion?

The PRIME MINISTER: We have considered this among other methods of securing economy in the country. We had to take into account, not merely the needs of the Empire, but the resources of this country.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

RAILWAY AND INLAND WATER TRAFFIC (SURCHARGE).

Mr. A. SHAW asked the Secretary of State for India whether he can now state the result arrived at as a consequence of the deliberations of the Indian legislature on the proposed surcharge on traffic carried by railway or inland waterways; and whether country boats are brought within the scope of this tax?

Mr. MONTAGU: In the Indian Finance Act recently passed it is provided that the surcharge on railway goods traffic and on coaching (other than passenger) traffic shall be at the rate of 2½ annas per rupee of freight, except in the case of food-grains and pulses, fodder and firewood, which are exempted. The surcharge on similar traffic carried by inland steam vessels is to be 1½ anna per rupee of freight, subject to the same exemptions. Country boat traffic is not brought within the scope of the tax.

ARMY OFFICERS (PAY).

Sir F. HALL asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Report of the Esher Committee on the pay of British officers serving in India was to the

effect that payment was being made on the basis of the rupee being worth 2s.; whether, at the present rate of exchange, the pay of officers serving in India amounts to actually less in sterling value than if they were serving in this country; whether a large proportion of the pay of married officers is, in a great many cases, sent here to provide for the education of their children; and whether, owing to the great distress caused by the reduced value of the rupee, he will undertake that officers serving in India shall receive their pay in rupees calculated upon the value of the rupee being 2s., instead of 1s. 3d., as it is at the present time?

Mr. MONTAGU: The answer to the first part of the question is in the negative. The Esher Committee recognised that the pay of officers of the Army in India must be fixed in rupees without reference to any particular rate of exchange. As regards the second part, it is the fact that in some instances the rupee rates of pay of British service officers in India are at present less than the home rates of pay and allowances converted at the current rate of exchange. This point is under consideration. As regards the third and fourth parts of the question, I regret that I cannot arrange for officers to remit a portion of their pay home at a privileged rate of 2s. the rupee, if that is what my hon. and gallant Friend suggests.

Monday, 11th April, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

POLITICAL DEPARTMENT (PAY).

71. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India for what reason the Government of India, in issuing the revised rates of pay for officers of the Indian Political Department, have fixed the pay of military officers employed in the political service on a lower scale than members of the Indian Civil Service performing exactly similar duties?

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Montagu): No change has been made in the system previously

in force, under which the same scale of pay is given to both military officers and members of the Indian Civil Service, but the latter receive a personal allowance in addition. The Government of India adhere to the view that the rates of pay for civil and military officers in the Political Department may properly be fixed with reference to the rates that they might have expected to draw in the ordinary course in the Indian Civil Service and Indian Army, respectively.

Sir C. YATE: Is there any reason why the Civil Service officers should get this personal allowance while the military officers do not get it?

Mr. MONTAGU: If my hon. and gallant Friend will read my answer he will find that the reason is given.

ROYAL INDIAN MARINE.

72. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India if he can now state when steps are to be taken for the re-organisation of the Royal Indian Marine into the Indian Navy?

Mr. MONTAGU: In view of the present financial stringency, any steps in this direction would be impracticable in the near future. As the Prime Minister informed the House on 16th March, the whole question of Empire naval policy and co-operation will be discussed at the Imperial Conference in June next.

Viscount CURZON: Is it or is it not the policy of the Government to create an Indian navy?

Mr. MONTAGU: No steps are being taken in the immediate future, but this question will be discussed.

Tuesday, 12th April, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

DR. DENNING'S CLAIM.

Mr. T. GRIFFITHS asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is now in a position to state the cost to the country of the legal proceedings in Den-

ning v. Secretary of State for India, and of the time and incidental costs of India Office officials in resisting Dr. Denning's claim; and, if so, the money paid out in respect of legal proceedings, the estimated cost incurred by the officials, the moneys paid to Dr. Denning, and the loss of income alleged in his statement of claim?

Mr. MONTAGU: The costs of the legal proceedings incurred by the Secretary of State in Council were £703 18s. 3d. As stated in answer to the hon. Member's question on 2nd March, the Secretary of State in Council also paid £500 to Dr. Denning on account of the latter's costs. These sums are chargeable to Indian revenues. There was no expenditure in respect of the time and incidental costs of India Office officials. The loss of income alleged in Dr. Denning's statement of claim was £2,728 including allowances.

Wednesday, 13th April, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

EUROPEAN GOODS (BOYCOTT).

2. **Mr. HAILWOOD** asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to a letter published by the Indo-British Association relating to an incident at Shajungi where the people with religious solemnity vowed to boycott European goods; and whether he has any information as to the extent of this policy in India, and the probable effect it will have upon the trade of Lancashire?

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Montagu): I have seen the letter referred to. I do not think the boycott suggested is receiving any substantial support, but I am inquiring.

OFFICERS' PAY AND PENSIONS.

4. **Mr. PENNEFATHER** asked the Secretary of State for India if his attention has been called to the fact that officers of Indian regiments returning to India from overseas have had their pay held up for sometimes five or six months,

[Mr. Pennefather.]

and that Indian Income Tax is now being deducted from these officers' pay from the arrears due to them for the time they were serving overseas; and whether he will put a stop to this practice?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am making inquiry of the Government of India.

10. Lieut.-Colonel Sir F. HALL asked the Secretary of State for India when he will be able to state what steps are to be taken to remedy the present condition in India under which the rupee rates of pay of British service officers in India are less than the Home rates of pay and allowances converted at the current rate of exchange?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am about to address the Government of India on this subject, and on receipt of their views the question will be dealt with as expeditiously as possible.

12. Colonel Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether he can now say what decision has been arrived at on the subject of the additional pensions of £200 and £100 a year which it was stated in the India Office Memorandum of 3rd June, 1920, would be granted to military officers of the Indian Army on the supernumerary list who had held high civil appointments?

Mr. MONTAGU: No decision has yet been arrived at on the subject referred to by my hon. and gallant Friend, but a telegram detailing the views of the Government of India thereon has been received recently and is now under consideration.

Sir C. YATE: Can the right hon. Gentleman say when I can put a further question and get the decision?

Mr. MONTAGU: I hope very shortly, but I will let my hon. and gallant Friend know in the course of a very few days.

ARMY REDUCTIONS.

7. Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India if he will give a list of the cavalry regiments and infantry battalions that were reduced prior to his undertaking that no further reductions should take place; and whether all further dismissals of men have been put a stop to?

Mr. MONTAGU: I hope my hon. and gallant Friend will allow me to circulate the answer in the OFFICIAL REPORT.

The following is the answer:

The following are the units which the Government of India report as having been disbanded up to 24th February of this year:

Indian Cavalry:

43rd Cavalry.

44th "

45th "

Additional Squadrons of—

35th Scinde Horse.

26th Light Cavalry.

7th Harizna Lancers.

39th (K.G.O.) C.I.H.

Indian Infantry and Pioneers:

2/40th Infantry.

2/44th Merwara Infantry.

2/86th Carnatic Infantry.

1/144th Infantry.

2/57th Wilde's Rifles.

3/103rd Mahratta Light Infantry.

2/131st Infantry.

1/133rd Infantry.

3/2nd Rajputs.

2/63rd Palamcottah Light Infantry.

2/99th Deccan Infantry.

2/28th Punjabis.

1/141st Punjabis.

1/142nd Punjabis.

3/30th Punjabis.

3/32nd Sikh Pioneers.

1/143rd Infantry.

4/30th Punjabis.

2/8th Rajputs.

1/131st United Provinces Regiment.

3/154th Infantry.

2/5th Light Infantry.

1/140th Infantry.

1/156th Infantry.

1/154th Infantry.

2/11th Rajputs.

2/130th Baluchistan Infantry.

2/153rd Punjabis.

85th Burman Rifles.

2/48th Pioneers.

2/43rd Erinpura Regiment.

2/151st Infantry.

1/152nd Infantry.

1/155th Infantry.

2/88th Carnatic Infantry.

3/3rd Queen Alexandra's Own Gurkha Rifles.

4/11th Gurkha Rifles.

2/155th Pioneers.

3/2nd King Edward's Own Gurkha Rifles.

49th Bengalies.

2/3rd Gaur Brahmins.

2/18th Infantry.
2/1st Brahmans.
3/150th Infantry.
2/75th Carnatic Infantry.
2/94th Russell's Infantry.
2/34th Sikh Pioneers.
2/80th Carnatic Infantry.
2/101st Grenadiers.
3/6th Gurkha Rifles.
2/95th Russell's Infantry.
2/81st Pioneers.

8. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India whether the battalions of the Machine Gun Corps now in India have been disbanded; and, if not, whether, considering the state of agitation and unrest now prevalent in India, the unsettled state of the frontier tribes and the uncertainty regarding Afghanistan, he will postpone their disbandment till more settled times?

Mr. MONTAGU: The battalions of the Machine Gun Corps in India have ceased to exist. The organisation of cavalry and infantry units in India, as at home, now includes machine gun troops and platoons.

RESERVED DEPARTMENTS, BENGAL.

11. **Sir F. LOWE** asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the action of the new Bengal Council in making a wholesale reduction in the grants for reserved Departments; and whether he proposes to take any steps to support the protest of the Governor and to prevent any recurrence of such action?

Mr. MONTAGU: I would refer the hon. Member to the replies which I gave to similar questions on the 23rd March. The Governor has, by Statute, complete powers to deal with the matter. I would refer the hon. Member to Section 72 D (2) (a) of the Act, and also to the Joint Committee's recommendations on Clause 11. Of course, His Excellency is assured of my full support in the exercise of his discretion and his use of the powers conferred upon him by Parliament.

Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS: Has the right hon. Gentleman heard from His Excellency as to what steps he is taking in this matter?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have not heard officially. I have seen reports in the newspapers that it was the intention of

the Governor to use his discretion, and he has restored, at any rate, certain of the items.

Sir F. LOWE: Will it be in the power of His Excellency to restore the grants which have been disallowed?

Mr. MONTAGU: The Governor has, of course, power to restore the grants.

Sir F. LOWE: Does he propose to exercise that power?

Mr. MONTAGU: That is within his discretion. I have not any official information, but I understand from newspaper reports that he has exercised the power.

Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS: As this is the first occasion on which interference has been made with the reserved services by the Indian Council, could the right hon. Gentleman not call for a full report on the matter?

Mr. MONTAGU: I will certainly give the House every information it requires, but I do not want it to appear that we desire to interfere with the discretion of the Governor. I do not think it is the first occasion; I think a similar case has occurred.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

COLONEL FRANK JOHNSON.

Colonel WEDGWOOD asked the Secretary of State for India, whether, subsequent to the exercise of martial-law in the Punjab, Colonel Frank Johnson, one of those censured in connection therewith, was granted a concession in connection with oil in either India or Burma; and, if so, on whose responsibility such a step was taken?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have ascertained that the officer named has not received a concession in Baluchistan or Assam. I have not yet heard as to the Punjab or Burma, but will let the hon. and gallant Member know.

BURMESE ASSOCIATIONS (PROTEST).

Mr. SWAN asked the Secretary of State for India whether he has received a cable from the Burmese associations protesting against a new policy of repres-

sion in Burma; in what this new policy consists, and what are the reasons for any such policy?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have received a telegram of the nature indicated. It does not state what are the acts against which it protests.

BOLSHEVIK GOLD.

Sir J. D. REES asked the Secretary of State for India whether the possession of Bolshevik gold, in like manner with the possession of rouble notes, is illegal in India under the operation of Act XXX. of 1920?

Mr. MONTAGU: The Act does not affect the possession of Bolshevik gold. I assume my hon. Friend to refer to gold obtained by the present Russian Government from its predecessor or private institutions in Russia. There is, I understand, no prohibition on the importation of gold from Russia into this country.

CENSUS.

Sir J. D. REES asked the Secretary of State for India whether in the forthcoming census the Indians in other parts of Asia than India, in Africa, and elsewhere will be counted; and whether due regard will be paid to the necessity for a comparative consideration of the economic conditions and cost of living in India, compared with the like conditions and cost in other Oriental and also in Occidental countries?

Mr. MONTAGU: The Indian Census has already been taken. Arrangements were made for collecting statistics of Indians in other parts of the British Empire, but not in foreign countries. Information regarding cost of living or economic conditions, except as regards occupations, was not collected at the census, and I do not think it would have been practicable to do so.

AMIR OF AFGHANISTAN.

Sir J. D. REES asked the Secretary of State for India whether any subsidy is now being paid to the Amir of Afghanistan; and, if so, whether the despatch of a delegation to Berlin, Poland, and Latvia to announce the accession of the new Amir and the complete independence of Afghanistan is compatible with the conditions under which such subsidy is paid?

Mr. MONTAGU: No subsidy is now being paid to the Amir of Afghanistan.

NATIVE REGIMENTS.

Major GLYN asked the Secretary of State for India how many Indian native regiments remain in Mesopotamia and Palestine; how many more have returned to India from service overseas; and what is the total number of units, both cavalry and infantry, that have been demobilised in India?

Mr. MONTAGU: At present there are 36 battalions of Indian infantry and five regiments of Indian cavalry in Mesopotamia and Persia, and five battalions of infantry and three regiments of cavalry in Palestine. Since 1st January, 22 infantry battalions and seven cavalry regiments have returned to India from overseas. The total numbers of units of which the demobilisation in India has been reported to me are four regiments of Indian cavalry and four additional squadrons, and 53 battalions of infantry. All these are temporary units raised during the War, and the demobilisation of such units is still in progress.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS (PUBLIC PARK).

Mr. FORREST asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that the Madras corporation has by a majority of one, and against general protest, given 22 acres of a public park in one of the most crowded districts of the city to a local dramatic society for the purposes of a theatre; and whether the Government has any power left to make representations against such a course?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have not previously heard of this matter. It is a matter within the discretion of the Government of Madras.

Thursday, 14th April, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

ROYAL ARMY MEDICAL CORPS OFFICERS
(PAY).

Lieut.-Colonel GUINNESS asked the Secretary of State for India whether the increases of pay of certain specified ser-

vices serving in India promised in Indian Army Order No. 868, of October, 1919, and sanctioned to date from the 1st of July, 1919, have in the case of the Royal Army Medical Corps taken effect only from 1st January, 1920, instead of from the earlier date as in the case of all other corps; and what is the reason for this distinction between officers who are serving under identical conditions?

Mr. MONTAGU: The pay of Royal Army Medical Corps officers in India was increased in March, 1920, with effect from 1st July, 1919. Consequent on an increase of pay granted to Indian Medical Service officers with effect from 1st January, 1920, a further increase has recently been granted to Royal Army Medical Corps officers with effect from the same date.

Monday, 18th April, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

DEMOBILISED OFFICERS' PASSAGES (INDIA).

73. **Colonel Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India if he is aware that large numbers of demobilised officers have been kept waiting for some months in Bombay for their passage home; and what steps are being taken in the matter?

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Montagu): My information does not coincide with that of my hon. and gallant Friend. On the contrary, I understand that the Government of India telegraphed two months ago that the accommodation on troopships exceeded the demand by 100 berths. But if he can let me have particulars of any recent delays, I will make inquiries.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

SIKH REGIMENT, AMRITSAR (UNFOUNDED REPORT).

Major GLYN asked the Secretary of State for India whether he has any information in regard to statements which

have appeared in the Press reporting serious insubordination in a Sikh regiment at Amritsar, in consequence of which the unit has been disbanded after 18 persons had been shot dead; and whether, if there is no truth in the statement, he will take steps to discover the source from which the report emanated?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have received a telegram from the Government of India, which states that there is not the slightest foundation of fact for the report to which my hon. and gallant Friend refers, and that no incident of this kind has occurred. As regards the last part of the question, the Government of India are already taking steps.

Tuesday, 19th April, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

COLONISATION (BRITISH SUBJECTS).

1. **Brigadier - General COCKERILL** asked the Secretary of State for India whether there still exist any restrictions on the colonisation of British India by British subjects, other than natives of India, or in the purchase, lease, or possession of land in British India by such British subjects; and, if so, what is their general effect?

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Montagu): There are no restrictions on the entry into British India of British subjects, provided that they are in possession of valid passports, nor on their purchase, lease, or possession of land in British India, except that purchases by serving Government officers from Indians are in certain cases subject to the orders of higher authority.

ARMY REDUCTIONS.

2. **Colonel Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in addition to the disbandment of the three cavalry regiments, four cavalry squadrons, and 52 battalions of infantry up to the 24th February last, the amalgamation of cavalry regiments and the reduction of pre-War infantry battalions is still being continued in India despite

[Sir C. Yate.]

his undertaking that no further reductions would be made pending consideration of the whole question by a Sub-Committee of the Committee of Imperial Defence?

Mr. MONTAGU: On 23rd February I informed the House that arrangements were being made to maintain in India 21 Indian cavalry regiments and 132 battalions of Indian infantry and pioneers. On 25th February I stated that there were in India eight British cavalry regiments, 45 British infantry battalions, and five companies of armoured cars. On 23rd March, and again on 6th April, I stated that no further reductions would be made pending the inquiry by the Sub-committee of the Committee of Imperial Defence. This undertaking is being, and will be, strictly adhered to.

ESTABLISHED CHURCH.

3. **Colonel WEDGWOOD** asked the Secretary of State for India what is the sum total annually paid out of Indian revenues, excepting for the British Army, for the salaries and upkeep of the Established Church in India; how much of this sum is paid under Section 118 of the Government of India Act, 1915, for the bishops and archdeacons of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay; and how much is outside and beyond this statutory contribution?

Mr. MONTAGU: It is difficult to give the figures as asked for in the first part of the question, because the chaplains of the Church of England and the Church of Scotland in India minister to both the troops and the civil population alike, and it is impossible to apportion exactly the total cost of salary and upkeep between the two. The most recent figures for the total cost of salaries and upkeep, are for the Church of England, £123,180, and for the Church of Scotland, £14,375, and the greater part of these sums is expenditure in connection with the British Army. Of the sum of £123,180, the sum of £7,625 is paid under the Statute in respect of the bishops and archdeacons mentioned.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: May I ask on what grounds the Indian taxpayers are taxed for the benefit of this particular Church?

Mr. MONTAGU: If my hon. and gallant Friend wishes for a statement on that, I must ask him to give me notice.

Wednesday, 20th April, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURES (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir J. D. REES asked the Secretary of State for India whether he has any information that other governors of provinces propose to issue circulars similar to that issued by Lord Sinha in Behar and Orissa suggesting that standing committees of legislative bodies should be attached to certain Departments of the provincial Government?

Mr. MONTAGU: No, Sir.

EGRET FEATHERS (EXPORT).

Mr. T. THOMSON asked the Secretary of State for India whether the export of egret feathers is still prohibited by the Indian Government; and, if so, how does he account for the large imports into this country of the feathers of the lesser white egret from India?

Mr. MONTAGU: The answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. If Indian egret feathers are being imported into this country, they are, presumably, being smuggled, and I shall be glad if the hon. Member will supply me with any information he may have on the subject.

Thursday, 21st April, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA (FRONTIER OPERATIONS).

Mr. KENYON asked the Secretary of State for India whether he can make a statement as to operations on the Indian frontier?

Mr. MONTAGU: The Government of India have reported that the protective picquets near Ladha were heavily attacked on March 24th. Our casualties amounted to 16 killed and 24 wounded. In retaliation, Makin was subjected to heavy air bombing. Since then organised

attacks have been made on our protective troops and convoys, involving hand-to-hand fighting. Our casualties from 5th to 10th April inclusive amounted to 34 killed and 76 wounded. I have asked the Government of India for an appreciation of the situation.

Monday, 25th April, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

SOVIET PROPAGANDA, INDIA.

33. **Lieut.-Colonel JAMES** asked the Prime Minister whether his attention has been called to a report appearing in a responsible Indian journal to the effect that the frontier attacks on British convoys by tribesmen are financed by Soviet money distributed by a well-defined system across the western portion of Waziristan; and whether, in the event of this report being substantially accurate, he will inform the House what steps it is proposed to take in regard to the Trade Agreement recently concluded with the representatives of Soviet Russia?

The PRIME MINISTER: My attention has been called to the report referred to. I am not in a position to make any statement as to its accuracy, but inquiries are being made. I would, however, refer my hon. and gallant Friend to the answer which I gave on Thursday last to a question by my hon Friend the Member for Newcastle North (Mr. Doyle).

INDIA.

PROVINCIAL COUNCIL ELECTIONS.

83. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he can now give the figures showing the number and proportion of electors who voted at the recent provincial council elections in India?

Mr. McCURDY: The papers are being formally presented to-day and will, I hope, be available at the end of the week.

ALLAHABAD UNIVERSITY.

84. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India if his attention has been called to the reports sent in by the examiners of the Allahabad University as to the poor quality of work done by

candidates for the various examinations in almost every subject, and the ignorance and inability on their part to answer questions requiring intelligent thought; and whether steps will now be taken to limit aspirants for a university course to those students who show some disposition and ability to profit by the instruction afforded?

Mr. McCURDY: My right hon. Friend has seen an article in the Press to the effect stated, but not the actual reports of the examiners. He is unable therefore to say whether the unfavourable extracts quoted afford a fair sample of the examiners' opinions as to the general quality of the students' work. As regards the second part of the question, the hon. and gallant Member is no doubt aware that this problem was one of those that engaged the special attention of the distinguished Commission presided over by Sir Michael Sadler, whose Report was issued in 1919 and presented to Parliament, and has been receiving the careful consideration of all local governments in India, and it will be for Ministers, subject to Statutory Rules, to take whatever action upon it they may judge necessary.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

BRITISH AND INDIAN SOLDIERS (COST).

Commander BELLAIRS asked the Secretary of State for India whether he can give any calculation as to the relative cost of a British and Native soldier per annum in India?

Mr. MONTAGU: A recent Estimate by the Government of India gives Rs. 1971 and Rs. 411 as the cost for a British and an Indian soldier respectively.

Tuesday, 26th April, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

SEDITIONOUS SPEECHES.

1. **Colonel Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India if his attention has been called to the speech

[Sir C. Yate.]

delivered by the agitator Mohammed Ali at Madras, reported in the Press of the 11th instant, in which he is stated to have said that he differed from Gandhi in that he favoured violence and that the English came to India like thieves and should be driven out like thieves; and what steps are being taken against the speaker and also to prevent the repetition and dissemination of seditious utterances like those tending to foment insurrection in India?

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Montagu): I have seen a newspaper report of the speech referred to. I will ask to be informed as to the steps, if any, taken or contemplated in the matter.

ELECTIONS, MADRAS.

2. **Sir J. D. REES** asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Governor of Madras has one Brahmin councillor and three non-Brahmin ministers; whether the anti-Brahmin agitation in the Madras Presidency has now been abandoned; whether in the Madras Presidency in urban districts from 43 to 72 per cent. and in rural districts from 20 to 59 per cent. of the electorate voted; and whether, in view of the novelty of parliamentary elections in India, these results may be considered extremely satisfactory?

Mr. MONTAGU: The answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. As regards the second part, in so far as the differences between Brahmins and non-Brahmins last year were due to the apprehension of the latter that they would not secure adequate representation on the new legislative council, the grounds for these differences should have been removed by the results of the elections in which non-Brahmins secured over 72 per cent. of the seats open to Hindus. As regards the third part of the question, percentages as high as those quoted were reached, though there were smaller polls than those quoted in some areas. I hope to make available to Parliament a detailed return of the results of the elections this week.

Sir J. D. REES: Has my right hon. Friend information that the results of the elections have actually tended to reduce friction between Brahmins and non-Brahmins, or does he only infer that such would be the natural result?

Mr. MONTAGU: I do not think I can usefully add anything to the reply I have given. When the Members of the House are in possession of the Return, which I propose to issue this week, they will form their own conclusions.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: Do not the results of the elections in Madras show that all those precautions provided under the Rules and Regulations, to give special representation to non-Brahmins, were mistaken, and at the same time showed a want of confidence in the people of India?

Mr. MONTAGU: I do not think they were mistaken, because they removed apprehension. How far you can judge by the issue of one election it is for the House to say.

Sir H. CRAIK: Is it not a fact that the number of the non-Brahmins elected is in no way excessive, looking at the comparative figures of population?

Mr. MONTAGU: If I answered that, I should be expressing an opinion as to the wisdom of the electorate, which I prefer not to do.

Sir C. YATE: Has the right hon. Gentleman read a book by the hon. Member for East Nottingham (Sir J. D. Rees) in which it is stated the Madras Brahmins always placed their heels on the necks of the lower classes and castes?

Mr. MONTAGU: If my hon. and gallant Friend sees no objection, I would prefer him to address that question to the hon. Member for East Nottingham.

Sir J. D. REES: If the hon. and gallant Member puts a question on the Paper, I shall answer it.

HIGH COURT JUDGES.

3. **Sir J. D. REES** asked the Secretary of State for India whether it is proposed to modify the law and practice relating to appointments to the High Court benches so as to bring both into conformity with conditions of the present day when the vakil bar is equal to the supply of any number of judges of equal ability and greater experience than the barristers, who are usually appointed puisne judges from the English Bar, for whom four places are at present reserved, while in Madras, for instance, only one of twelve judges is a vakil?

Mr. MONTAGU: The Government of India have undertaken, in accordance with views expressed in a debate in the Legislative Assembly on the 24th February last, to consult local governments, High Courts, and others as to the creation of an Indian Bar. If such a Bar were created, the matter referred to in the question would come under review, but I am not otherwise aware of any proposal the effect of which would be to modify the existing law and practice. This requires that where, as in Madras, there are twelve permanent High Court judges, not less than four should be barristers of England or Ireland or members of the Faculty of Advocates in Scotland, of not less than five years' standing.

Sir J. D. REES: Does the right hon. Gentleman not think that one Indian judge, out of an admittedly capable and large Bar, is a very small representation of that body, and is there not a case for reconsidering the rules applying to these appointments?

Mr. MONTAGU: I will consider any representation made to me by my hon. Friend, but that was not the question on the Paper.

TRADE UNIONS.

4. Colonel WEDGWOOD asked the Secretary of State for India whether any legislation legalising trade unions in India has yet been drafted or introduced into the Legislative Assembly?

Mr. MONTAGU: Legislation has not yet been introduced. I have not yet seen any draft.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: Is the right hon. Gentleman taking any steps to urge the Government of India to introduce this very necessary reform?

Mr. MONTAGU: The Government of India have already announced, on their own initiative, their intention to introduce legislation. I would remind my hon. Friend that the Legislature of India is not in Session.

Sir M. DOCKRELL: Can the right hon. Gentleman say whether peaceful picketing will be installed under this system?

DR. KICBLEW AND RHAMBHUJ DUTT.

5. Colonel WEDGWOOD asked the Secretary of State for India whether he has yet any information as to the alleged arrest of Dr. Kichlew and Rhambhuj Dutt?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have ascertained from the Government of India that these gentlemen have not been arrested.

Sir C. YATE: Has the right hon. Gentleman considered that these two men were leaders of the rebellion of 1919, and can he say for what reason they were pardoned unconditionally and allowed to resume their anti-Government propaganda?

CAVALRY REGIMENTS (REDUCTION).

6. Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether the reduction of the 39 pre-war Indian cavalry regiments of four squadrons each to 21 regiments of three squadrons each is now being proceeded with; and, if it is, will he give directions that no further reductions are to be made pending the inquiry by the Sub-committee of the Committee of Imperial Defence?

Mr. MONTAGU: I would refer the hon. and gallant Member to the answers which I gave him on the 6th and on the 19th instant.

Sir C. YATE: Does that mean that these reductions are being carried out or does it not?

Mr. MONTAGU: If my Friend will read these answers, he will see I have given an explicit statement.

Sir C. YATE: Can he explain his meaning exactly, because I cannot get it out of these answers?

Mr. MONTAGU: My hon. and gallant Friend puts that question weekly. I have tried to draft a different answer weekly conveying the same information. On this occasion I have failed.

Sir C. YATE: Are the reductions being carried out, or are they not?

DISTURBANCES, NORTH-WEST FRONTIER.

7. Captain Viscount CURZON asked the Secretary of State for India whether he can make any statement with reference to the fighting on the North-West Frontier; whether these disturbances

ARMY OFFICERS (REPATRIATION).

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that 200 officers are at present detained at Deolali awaiting repatriation from Bombay, and that more are arriving daily; that many of these officers have already been kept waiting for some seven weeks; that, owing to transport being hopelessly inadequate, only 36 officers have been repatriated from Deolali since 1st March last; that the above figures do not include the married families; and what steps does he propose to take to repatriate these officers?

Mr. MONTAGU: One hundred and thirty officers left India on 1st March for demobilisation. I have no precise figures for the number who have sailed since, but it is considerably in excess of 36. Since my answer to my hon. and gallant Friend's question on the same subject on 18th April, I have received the following information from India. All military officers at Deolali and others now awaiting entitled passages number 216 and the total of berths required for officers and their families 566. For these 154 berths are in sight on Government transports and passages by private steamers are being booked. I anticipate that all will have sailed before the end of June, but I expect further information.

DIVORCE DECREES, INDIA.

Mr. RENDALL asked the Attorney-General whether, seeing that the considered judgment of the President of the Divorce Court on the validity of Indian divorces in the case of *Keys v. Keys* and *Gray* was given on 10th March, and that that judgment has invalidated the marriages of many hundreds of persons, whose marriages are thereby declared to be illegal, and the children of such marriages illegitimate, the Government intends to carry out its promise made by the Attorney-General on 15th March to repair these terrible results of the East India Councils Act of 1861, and introduce immediately legislation to regularise these unions and legitimise the children; and will such legislation when introduced fully secure the interests of such children if either parent has died before such legislation is passed?

Mr. MONTAGU: Yes, Sir. Legislation will be introduced in another place at the earliest opportunity. The answer to the last part of the question is in the affirmative.

Monday, 2nd May, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

EAST AFRICAN OPERATIONS
(COLONEL AITKEN).

94. Lieut.-Colonel CROFT asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the vindication of Colonel Aitken with regard to the East African operations in 1914, he can now state if steps have been taken to settle what recognition and compensation will be granted to this officer?

Mr. PARKER (Lord of the Treasury): My right hon. Friend has referred the question to the Government of India for their consideration, and is awaiting their reply, which he has requested them to telegraph.

INDIAN ARMY OFFICERS (PAY).

95. Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether a decision has yet been arrived at with the War Office regarding the adjustment of the pay of those officers of the Indian Army who were retained in the Army on account of the War beyond the date on which they became due to be placed on the retired list; and, if so, with what result?

Mr. PARKER: This subject is still under consideration, but it is hoped that a decision may be made shortly.

OVERSEA SETTLEMENT (INDIAN OFFICERS).

97. Sir F. FLANNERY asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the fact that officers and men of the Royal Navy, Royal Air Force, and the British Army are eligible for grants of passages overseas under the overseas settlement scheme, but that officers and men who

have served in the Indian Army during the War are ineligible; whether he can explain the reason for such discrimination against officers and men of the Indian Army who have equally served the country with those of the other forces above named; and whether the Government will take steps to remove this injustice with a view to giving free passages within reasonable limits, both outwards and homewards, for resumption of resident settlement after War service?

The PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY to the ADMIRALTY (Mr. Amery): I have been asked to answer this question. The oversea settlement scheme is intended to provide free passages from the United Kingdom to other parts of the British Empire for approved ex-members of those forces of the Crown for which payment was made exclusively out of monies provided by the Parliament of the United Kingdom. The scheme does not, therefore, apply to the forces paid for from the revenues of the various Dominions and Colonies and of India.

Sir F. FLANNERY: In view of the obvious injustice to these officers who have served in the Indian Army and are less favourably treated than officers who have served elsewhere, will the Government reconsider the question with a view to legislation?

Mr. AMERY: It is not a question of where the officers and men have served, but of the part of the Empire to which the forces in which they served belonged, and this question is for the Government of India to decide.

Sir C. YATE: Will the hon. Gentleman represent that to the Government of India?

Mr. AMERY: I am sure that my hon. and gallant Friend is capable of representing that for himself.

Captain REDMOND: Will the hon. Member give these free passes to the Black and Tans?

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

MEDICAL SERVICE (APPEALS).

Major GLYN asked the Secretary of State for India whether British officers of the Indian Medical Service have any

right of appeal if the contention is upheld that such officers have no right of appeal under Section 42 of the Army Act, and with special reference to the notification in the "London Gazette" of the 15th March, page 2099; and, if so, by what procedure can they appeal?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am advised that officers of the Indian Medical Service have no right of appeal under Section 42 of the Army Act, but have a right of appeal to the Governor-General under Section 180 (2) (d) of that Act. If dissatisfied with his orders they may then appeal to the Secretary of State for India, and through him to His Majesty the King.

Tuesday, 3rd May, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

DISORDERS (CONVICTIONS).

1. **Colonel WEDGWOOD** asked the Secretary of State for India whether any and, if so, how many political prisoners are now in gaol in India or the Andamans as a result of the Bengal troubles of 1915, or the Punjab troubles of 1919, who have not had extended to them the Royal clemency?

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Montagu): I do not understand what is meant by the "Bengal troubles of 1915." If the hon. and gallant Member will state his requirements more clearly, I will make inquiries. As to the Punjab, if by "political prisoners in gaol as a result of the Punjab troubles in 1919," the hon. and gallant Member means persons convicted of participation in the disorders in the Punjab and elsewhere in April, 1919, the answer is, I think, 86.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: Is there any proposal to reduce this number, and to extend the Royal clemency to people for whom it was intended? Also were there not Gandhi troubles in Bombay and Bengal in 1915?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have got the figures with regard to what I understand the hon. and gallant Member means by the Punjab troubles. I have seen a statement that the Viceroy is reviewing these cases himself.

2. **Colonel WEDGWOOD** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he has yet any information as to the proposed change of Gujranwala station in order to punish the town for the Punjab riots?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have not yet received the result of the inquiry I made in response to the hon. and gallant Member's question on the 23rd March. I will let him know as soon as it arrives.

MURDERS, NANKANA.

3. **Colonel WEDGWOOD** asked the Secretary of State for India whether recently at Nankana 130 Sikhs were burned to death by a Mohant and his 50 Pathan mercenaries; whether the arrival and presence of these Pathans was known to the Punjab government; if so, what steps they took to prevent the massacre; and what punishment has been meted out to the murderers?

Mr. MONTAGU: Communiqués were issued to the Press two months ago showing that 130 Sikhs were killed and their bodies burnt; and the Mohant at Nankana and 26 Pathan watchmen are among those arrested. I have not the information asked for in the second and third parts of the question, nor the exact details asked for in the last part. If the hon. and gallant Member desires these, it will be necessary for me to obtain them from India.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: Is the trial still going on? Is the case *sub judice*?

Mr. MONTAGU: I think so.

REPARATION CLAIM.

4. **Sir J. D. REES** asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Legislative Assembly carried a motion claiming for India as a member of the League of Nations a share of the indemnity to be exacted from Germany; if so, whether this claim is allowed by His Majesty's Government to be valid; and whether His Majesty's Government or the Government of India will determine the amount due?

Mr. MONTAGU: A motion to the effect stated by my hon. Friend was unanimously adopted by the Council of State on 26th March. The claim is allowed as valid by His Majesty's Government. The amount is under discussion.

Lieut.-Commander KENWORTHY: Is any portion of the proceeds of the

Reparation Act being paid over to India, and has India introduced the same method of raising money by a Reparation Bill as this country?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that that arises out of the question on the Paper.

NON-CO-OPERATION MEETINGS.

5. **Colonel Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India whether the crowds attending Mr. Gandhi's non-co-operation meetings in India intimidate the railway staff, take possession of the railway carriages, and travel to and fro without tickets; and, if so, what steps are the Government taking to prevent it?

Mr. MONTAGU: On receiving notice of my hon. and gallant Friend's question, I made inquiries by telegram, but have not yet received a reply. I hope to be able to answer his question shortly.

SEDITIONOUS SPEECHES, MADRAS.

6. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been drawn to the statements made by Muhammed Ali at Madras, namely, that if Afghanistan came to India to fight the British Government the Ali brothers would help Afghanistan, and the further statement that he would be quite content that his brother and he should give up their lives if at the same time the British Empire should breathe its last; and whether the Government intend to tolerate language of this nature, which is a direct incitement to rebellion?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have seen in the Press an extract which appears to be from the speech in question. I have been informed by telegram that the matter has been, and is at the moment, engaging the attention of the Government of India.

RUPEE (DEPRECIATION).

7. **Mr. CLOUGH** asked the Secretary of State for India if he has received any further advice from the Government of India making any practical suggestions for dealing with the industrial depression caused by the depreciation of the rupee?

Mr. MONTAGU: The exchange position was fully discussed by the Finance Member of the Government of India in introducing the Indian Budget last

March, and I am sending my hon. Friend a copy of his speech. My hon. Friend will see that the Government of India do not consider that there are any practicable steps that they can usefully take at the present time with a view to meeting the difficulties.

RIOTS, MALEGAON.

8. **Captain Viscount CURZON** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he can give any information with regard to the reports of the rioting at Malegaon, and as to the causes of such riots?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have not yet received any further information from the Government of India beyond what I have already communicated to the Press on 28th April and 2nd May.

MADRAS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL (WOMEN).

9. **Sir J. D. REES** asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Madras Legislative Council has decided to abolish the sex disqualification for admission to the roll of electors; and, if so, whether the effect of such resolution will be to enfranchise any women other than such as have separate property?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have seen reports in the Press to this effect, but have not yet received the official proceedings. As regards the second part of the question, the effect of such a resolution, in the words of the rule approved by Parliament, is that "the local Government shall make regulations providing that women, or a class of women, as the case may be, shall not be disqualified for registration by reason only of their sex."

In other words, the qualifications for registration as electors would be exactly the same for women as for men. What those qualifications are the hon. Baronet can ascertain from the rules as approved by Parliament.

CAVALRY REGIMENTS (REDUCTION).

10. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary for India whether the reduction of the 39 pre-War Indian cavalry regiments of four squadrons each to 21 regiments of three squadrons each is now being carried out or not?

Mr. MONTAGU: As I stated in reply to the hon. and gallant Member on the 19th and 6th of April, the answer is in the affirmative.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

EXCISE REVENUE.

Mr. S. ROBINSON asked the Secretary of State for India the net Excise revenue of India for the years 1917-18, 1918-19, and 1919-20, respectively; what was the recorded consumption of country spirits in each of those years in Bengal, Madras, Bombay, Sind, Bihar and Orissa, the United Provinces, the Punjab, the Central Provinces and Berar, Assam, and Burma, respectively; and what proportion of the total revenue of each province is represented by the revenues derived from this source?

Mr. MONTAGU: The following statement gives the information required:—

	1917-18.	1918-19.	1919-20.
	£	£	£
Net Excise Revenue of India (a) ...	10,057,395	11,421,524	12,663,571
	Proof gallons.	Proof gallons.	Proof gallons.
Country spirit issued from Central Distilleries, public or private (b):—			
Bengal	700,586	796,972	Not available.
Madras	1,648,150	1,672,492	1,988,688
Bombay	2,734,739	2,492,128	2,665,227
Sind	194,830	200,934	215,948
Bihar and Orissa	1,070,081	1,272,937	1,367,942
United Provinces	1,459,984	1,468,020	1,115,934
Punjab	398,041	456,837	545,271
Central Provinces and Berar	1,098,299	1,221,137	Not available.
Assam	200,685	225,571	286,599
Burma	82,152	97,609	Not available.

(a) i.e., gross revenue less refunds, drawbacks and compensations.

(b) Excluding outstill areas for which statistics of consumption are not available.

the War; what steps, if any, are being taken to encourage British-born students to enter the Indian Medical Service; and what are the proportions of candidates to enter the service, British and Indian, in 1910, 1914, 1918, and 1920?

Mr. MONTAGU: The number of officers holding permanent commissions in the Indian Medical Service on 1st January, 1921, was 767. The following table gives the numbers of permanent officers in the Indian Medical Service on 1st January, 1910, 1914, 1918, and 1921:

—			British born.	Indians	Total.
1910	694	37	731
1914	722	48	770
1918	712	71	783
1921	638	129	767

The distribution as between British-born officers and Indians has been arrived at after an examination of the names in the Army List and must therefore be regarded as only approximately correct. I am not sure that I understand what is meant by that part of the question regarding British-born officers who joined the Service before the War. The position of such officers is in no way jeopardized by the admission of officers, European or Indian, during the War. Every effort is being made to fill up existing vacancies available for Europeans and the conditions as regards pay, leave and pension have recently been considerably improved. I am advised, however, in view of the great shortage of medical men caused by the War, that it will be a year before the Medical Schools of this country are in a position to turn out qualified men of the standard required for the Service in anything like the normal numbers. The following are the numbers of candidates who entered the Service in 1910, 1914, 1918, and 1920:

—	Euro-peans.	Indians.	Total.
1910 (examination)	22	6	28
1914 (examination)	18	15	33
1918 (selection) ...	9	9	19
1920 (selection) ...	23	52	75

Thursday, 5th May, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

AFGHANISTAN (TREATY NEGOTIATIONS).

Sir W. de FRECE asked the Secretary of State for India if he can give the latest information regarding the British-Afghan Treaty negotiations and those between Afghanistan and Turkey?

Mr. MONTAGU: I regret that I cannot, consistently with the public interest, make a statement on either subject at present.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT (OFFICERS' PENSIONS).

Sir A. HOLBROOK asked the Secretary of State for India whether he has now received the Report from the Government of India as to the percentage of Forest and Public Works Department European officers who had refused the new pension scheme; and what proportion of the number of such officers was represented by these refusals?

Mr. MONTAGU: In a telegram received on 1st May, the Government of India stated that the percentage of officers of the Public Works Department with less than 20 years' service, who failed to exercise the option by the date specified, was 87; that officers of the Forest Department have been allowed to defer their declaration, but that only 16 per cent. have so far elected to come under the new rules.

PUNJAB MARTIAL LAW PRISONERS.

Colonel WEDGWOOD asked the Secretary of State for India how many of the Punjab martial law prisoners are still in prison; how many have been released during this year; when is it contemplated the complete the Royal clemency so far as these culprits are concerned; and what has been done in the special cases of Bugga, of Amritsar, and Diwan Chand, of Kasur, both of whose convictions aroused so much doubt and protest?

Mr. MONTAGU: In reply to a question in the Legislative Assembly on the 17th February, the Home Secretary stated

that 86 Punjab martial law prisoners were still in confinement out of 1,779 originally convicted, and that the Government of India did not propose to exercise any further clemency in their cases beyond the commutations and reductions of sentences already made. Bugga, son of Paira Mal, of Amritsar, and Diwan, son of Kishna, of Kasur, are among the 86.

BRITISH ARMY OFFICERS (PAY AND ALLOWANCES).

Lieut.-Colonel CROFT asked the Secretary of State for India what steps he proposes to take to improve the rates of pay and allowances at present issued to British officers of the British Army serving in India?

Mr. MONTAGU: I presume that the hon. and gallant Member is referring to the effect of the fall in the exchange value of the rupee. As stated in my reply to my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Dulwich (Sir F. Hall) on the 13th April, I am at present in consultation with the Government of India on this subject.

PUNJAB ELECTORAL RULES.

Colonel WEDGWOOD asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to an article by Sir Valentine Chirol in which he blames the gerrymandering of the constituencies and franchise in the Punjab for the unrepresentative character of the Punjab Council; and will he press the Government of India to revise the rules and regulations for that province in accordance with British practice?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have seen an article in which Sir Valentine Chirol gives his opinion as to the Legislative Council in the Punjab. The electoral rules can only be revised by Parliament, but I have no doubt that the Government of India and the local Governments will consider, in the light of the experience gained from the first elections, whether any alterations are necessary before the next general election.

CIVIL SERVICE PENSIONS.

Sir A. HOLBROOK asked the Secretary of State for India whether any decision has been made with regard to the appeal on behalf of retired officers of the Indian Civil Services who retired before the 23rd of July, 1913, for a revision of their pen-

sions; is he aware that these pensions are at the present time worth about one-third of the sums they were granted on retirement; and as the revenues of India are in a flourishing condition, and there is therefore no financial obstacle, will he apply the better pensionary terms recommended by the Public Services Commission appointed in 1912 to all retired officers without any line being drawn, as was done recently in the case of retired Egyptian civil servants?

Mr. MONTAGU: A deputation of Members of this House on this subject was received by me in Council on 6th April, and the Government of India have been asked if they have any observations to make on the representations of that deputation, but as at present advised I am not prepared to modify the decision already reached.

INJURED ARMY OFFICER (GRATUITY).

Mr. RAWLINSON asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the case of Mr. K. M. B. Codrington, whose leg, having been broken at the Indian Army Cadet College, Wellington, in 1917, was so improperly and inefficiently treated at Wellington and Quetta, and subsequently at other places, that it gradually became worse, and finally was declared incurable, Mr. Codrington being permanently disabled and invalidated from the service in 1920; and whether he will, having regard to the injury and loss Mr. Codrington has sustained, see his way to grant him a pension for life or, at all events, make a grant to enable him to continue his education at Cambridge in order to fit himself to earn his living in some walk of life other than the Army?

Mr. MONTAGU: The accident to Mr. K. de B. Codrington took place before he was commissioned, but he was admitted to the Army and drew pay and leave pay as an officer for nearly three years in the hope that he would eventually recover his health. During the last year of his leave he was studying at Cambridge, and on being finally invalidated from the Army in November last he was granted a gratuity of six months' pay according to precedent. In addition, he received £80 10s. 9d. in respect of the higher rates of leave pay recently sanctioned. I must not be

understood as accepting the description given by the hon. Member of the medical treatment in India; but if, owing to his health, or for other sufficient reasons, Mr. Codrington's course at Cambridge has to be prolonged I shall be prepared to consider the question of granting some further gratuity.

Friday, 6th May, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

GOLD STANDARD RESERVE, INDIA.

Mr. R. GWYNNE asked the Secretary of State for India what is the present position of the Indian gold standard reserve fund; how the present position compares with that existing in 1916; and, if the comparison is in favour of the position in 1916, what steps are being taken to bring the reserve back to its former level?

Mr. MONTAGU: On 30th April, 1916, the gold standard reserve stood at £26,300,085. On 30th April, 1921, the corresponding figure was £39,241,537, representing an increase of nearly £13,000,000. The last part of the question does not therefore arise.

Monday, 9th May, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIAN ARMY (OFFICERS' ALLOWANCES).

64. Colonel Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether he can now state when the British married officers of the Indian Army are to be given the same allowances as are given to married officers of the British Service quartered in India?

Mr. J. PARKER (Lord of the Treasury, for Mr. Montagu): The allowance given to married subalterns of the British Service in India, which I suppose is what my

hon. and gallant Friend has in mind, is confined to officers commissioned from the ranks while serving therein on ordinary engagements. The question of the extension of this concession to officers of the Indian Army does not arise, as there is no corresponding class.

Tuesday, 10th May, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

AUXILIARY FORCE.

2. Colonel Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether the 32,000 men proposed for the Indian Auxiliary Force were voluntarily recruited by the 31st March last; if not, what steps he proposes to take in the matter, and what was the maximum strength attained by the Indian Defence Force during the War under the Compulsory Service Act?

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Montagu): I have not yet received the figures up to the 31st March last, but have asked for them.

INFANTRY BATTALIONS.

3. Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether any pre-War battalions of infantry have been disbanded in India, and, if so, which; and whether orders have lately been issued for the future disbandment of the 1st battalion of the 44th Merwara infantry or any other pre-War Indian regiment?

Mr. MONTAGU: No pre-War battalions of infantry in India have yet been disbanded. Orders have been issued for the disbandment of the 44th Merwara infantry. So far, this is the only pre-War battalion of which I have received information that it is to be disbanded, but it is evident that if certain new units, such as Burmese, Kumaonis, etc., are to be retained, an equivalent number of old units must disappear. As I have already stated, the number of Indian infantry battalions which it is proposed to maintain after the War is the same

as the number maintained before the War.

GOVERNMENT OFFICERS (RETIREMENT).

4. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India how many applications have been received by the Government of India from officers in India for permission to retire on proportionate pensions, under the recommendation made in Clause 36 of the Report of the Joint Select Committee on the Government of India Bill; and what orders have been issued thereon?

Mr. MONTAGU: Up to the 1st April last, one such application had been received by the Government of India. They informed the applicant that they could not support his request, as it was evident that his desire to retire was of long standing, and based mainly on reasons quite unconnected with those discussed by the Joint Select Committee.

MALEGAON RIOTS.

5. **Captain Viscount CURZON** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he can now give an account of the reported rioting at Malegaon, and of the cause which led up to it?

Mr. MONTAGU: A further report has just been received from the Government of Bombay. I will circulate this in the OFFICIAL REPORT, and communicate it to the Press.

Following is the report:—

"The Bombay Government report that a disturbance was threatened on 25th April owing to the prosecution of several Momins (Mohammedan weavers) for carrying arms at mass meetings, and their refusal to pay fines on conviction, and consequent imprisonment. The Mamlatdar, a resident magistrate, and the city sub-inspector of police (the latter with three or four armed constables) proceeded to the town. The mob attacked the city sub-inspector of police, whose men fired some rounds in the air. The mob did not disperse, and the police took refuge in the house of Mr. Pophale, a merchant, adjoining a temple. Failing to apprehend the sub-inspector of police, the mob brought fuel and kerosene and fired several houses and also the temple. The merchant and his family are said to have escaped, also one or two constables, but the sub-inspector of police, who attempted to escape in woman's garb, was caught, beaten to death, and thrown in the fire. It is reported to be practically certain that one

or two constables were also killed. The Mamlatdar and resident magistrate were stoned, but escaped. The mob then cut the telegraph wire, stopped the mail tongas from running, and drove the armed police out of the town. Several of these were beaten, and some are said to have been killed. The mob enforced a *hartal* and are reported to have looted shops of loyal persons. Prompt arrival of troops and police had a good effect, and order has now been restored, but the attitude of the town is reported to be sullen and obstinate. A force of 200 police is now in the town together with a detachment of troops."

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

MILITARY OPERATIONS, NORTH-WEST FRONTIER (CASUALTIES).

Mr. FORREST asked the Secretary of State for India the present position of affairs on the North-West Frontier of India; how many military operations there have been since the beginning of 1919; what have been our casualties; and what have been, and more especially what are, the causes of the constant tribal aggression against our troops?

Mr. MONTAGU: The present position on the North-West Frontier is that no military operations are now being carried out except in Waziristan, where the Wana-Wazirs have so far refused to submit to the terms imposed upon them by the Government of India, and certain recalcitrant Mahsuds are also showing renewed activity. The answer to the second part is three. Firstly, the third Afghan War of 1919 and the concurrent Waziristan operations; secondly, the Waziristan operations of November, 1919, to May, 1920; and, thirdly, the minor operations now in progress in Waziristan against the Wana-Wazirs and other recalcitrant tribesmen. With the hon. Members permission, I will circulate the details of our casualties with the OFFICIAL REPORT. As regards the last part of the question, I would refer my hon. Friend to the answer given in this House on May 4th to the hon. and gallant Member for the Melton Division of Leicestershire (Sir C. Yate), of which I will send him a copy.

Following are the details promised:—

The casualties from 2nd January, 1919, to 30th April, 1920, the period which covers the major operations mentioned above, amounted to:

Killed, died of wounds, and died of disease:

Total British 301

Total Indian, including followers 4667

Wounded:

British 277

Indian, including followers ... 2730

Missing:

British 3

Indian 827

From 1st May, 1920, to 30th April, 1921:

Killed, died of wounds, and died of disease:

Total British 37

Total Indian, including followers 434

Wounded:

Total British 35

Total Indian 432

Wednesday, 11th May, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIAN ARMY (DRESS).

85. Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether the alterations in dress effected by Indian Army Orders No. 92 and No. 96, of February, 1921, have been carried out for reasons of economy, or for what reason; and whether he is aware that these alterations in the badges and shoulder titles which have been worn by Indian regiments for many years are causing disappointment amongst the troops concerned?

Mr. T. JONES: My right hon. Friend is not aware of the reasons for the changes which has been ordered by the Commander-in-Chief, but they appear to be entirely within his competence to deal with. He is not aware that the alterations referred to have caused disappointment.

Thursday, 12th May, 1921.

EAST INDIA (INCOME AND EXPENDITURE).

Address for Return of the Net Income and Expenditure for British India, under certain specified heads, for the three years from 1917-18 to 1919-20 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper No. 184, of Session 1920).—[Mr. Montagu.]

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

SEDITIONOUS LITERATURE (PROSECUTIONS, SINGAPORE).

Sir W. de FRECE asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the prosecution at Singapore of 17 Indians charged with the possession of seditious literature of American origin conveyed apparently on board a British vessel; what was the result of the trial; and to what extent this practice prevails of trying to introduce into India printed matter intended to be subversive of British rule?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have seen reports of the incident referred to. The literature included the publications of the revolutionary Indian organisations in America. I have not yet heard the result of the trial. It is undoubtedly the case that efforts are continually being made to introduce such matter into India, but to judge from the method adopted on this occasion it is, I am glad to say, found to be difficult.

SILLADAR AND NON-SILLADAR CAVALRY REGIMENTS.

Sir K. FRASER asked the Secretary of State for India if he is aware that there are 38 Silladar cavalry regiments in the Indian Army, and that it is proposed to disband a large number of these; that these Silladar regiments are recruited from yeomen, men who mostly own their land; that these regiments are self-supporting; that the soldier in these regiments pays for his own horse and for all his equipment, with the exception of his carbine, which is supplied to him by Government; what is the monthly pay of a soldier in an Indian cavalry regiment at

the present rate of exchange of the rupee; and, in view of the dissatisfaction that will be caused by the proposed abolition of these Indian cavalry regiments, can this decision be reconsidered?

Mr. MONTAGU: There are 36 Silladar and 3 non-Silladar regiments of cavalry in the Indian Army. It is proposed, on the recommendation of the Commander-in-Chief, to reduce this number by a process of amalgamation to 21 regiments, all of which will be non-Silladar. The respective merits of the Silladar and non-Silladar system have been carefully considered; and while the advantages claimed for the Silladar system have not been overlooked, the conclusion has been reached that the non-Silladar system is better suited to modern needs. The reasons against the retention of the Silladar system are as follow:

- (i) It is unequal to the strain of a prolonged war, and automatically ceases to function.
- (ii) The wastage in horses has to be met by the Government in war.
- (iii) The wastage in men has to be met by enlisting men who cannot always contribute towards the cost of horses, etc., and so automatically cease to be Silladars.
- (iv) The replacement of all equipment has to be made in war by Government Departments.
- (v) The administration in peace of the Silladar accounts, regimental remounting, provision of equipment and clothing, management of horse runs and grass farms, absorbs an undue proportion of the officers' attention, to the neglect of preparation for war.
- (vi) The equipment, etc., is not standardised, and this leads to confusion in war.
- (vii) In peace no use is made of the Government supply services (supplies, transport, veterinary, ordnance) who thus have an undue extra strain thrown on them in war.
- (viii) The vested interests of regiments in their lines and barracks complicate reliefs and even adversely affects training.

The opinions obtained from a representative number of commanding officers showed a large majority in favour of abolishing the Silladar system.

The whole question of the army needed for the defence of India is to be examined by a sub-committee of the Committee of Imperial Defence.

The pay of a non-Silladar cavalry soldier is Rs. 18 per mensem, equivalent at the current rate of exchange to £1 4s.

Friday, 13th May, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

MESOPOTAMIA (LANCE-CORPORAL M'ARTHUR).

Sir G. COLLINS asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been drawn to the case of Lance-Corporal Duncan M'Arthur, of the civil gaol, Bagdad, whose body was found on the outskirts of Bagdad on Saturday morning, 12th March; whether he is aware that this soldier was wounded during the Persian Gulf campaign; and will he take steps to grant a pension to his mother?

Mr. WOOD: The facts of this case were reported by the High Commissioner of Mesopotamia immediately, and were communicated without delay to the next of kin. The answer to the second part is in the negative. As to the third part, it appears from the High Commissioner's report that the deceased had ceased at the time of his death to be employed by the Mesopotamia Government; but in any case he would not have been entitled to a pension, for the contract under which he had been employed carried no pension rights.

Tuesday, 24th May, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

PUNJAB COUNCIL (PUBLICITY GRANT).

1. **Colonel Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Punjab Council have refused to sanction the Budget grant for the Publicity Department; and, if so, what steps the

[Sir C. Yate.]

Government propose to take to place the true facts of the situations that arise in India before the people?

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Montagu): The answer to the first part is in the affirmative. All Governments in India are taking active and successful steps to supply the public with accurate information.

Sir C. YATE: Does that mean that one of the first acts of the reformed Council will be to put a stop to all efforts on the part of the Government to prohibit revolutionary propaganda in the Punjab?

Mr. MONTAGU: The reply to that question would require consideration. Perhaps my hon. and gallant Friend would put it on the Paper.

RIOTS, MALEGAON.

2. **Captain Viscount CURZON** asked the Secretary of State for India what is the state of affairs at Malegaon; whether the recent riots there were due to the agitation of an individual called Ghandhi; and whether any other disturbances have been reported between the 12th and the 24th which could be attributed to the action of this man?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have no further information regarding the Malegaon disturbances beyond that already issued to the Press on the 28th April and the 2nd, 10th, and 13th May. I will send the Noble Lord copies of these communiqués. I have heard of no disturbances between the 12th and 24th May.

PUNJAB DISTURBANCES.

3. **Sir J. D. REES** asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Viceroy and Governor-General has visited Lahore to consider the disputes relating to the shrines of Gardwaras; and, if so, whether he can make any communication on this subject and the payment of increased grants for payment of compensation to sufferers by the disturbances in the Punjab?

Mr. MONTAGU: The reply to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. I will place in the Library a copy of the speech in which the Viceroy dealt with the two points to which the hon. Baronet refers.

BUDGET.

4. **Sir J. D. REES** asked the Secretary of State for India whether the arrangement under which the Council of State is unable to discuss the Budget is of a permanent or an irrevocable character?

Mr. MONTAGU: No, Sir. The Standing Order of the Council which prevents discussion is alterable by the Council itself, with the consent of the Governor-General.

AFGHANISTAN (BRITISH MISSION).

5. **Sir J. D. REES** asked the Secretary of State for India whether there is any further information to give the House regarding the results of the negotiations of the British Mission at Kabul?

Mr. MONTAGU: The negotiations are still proceeding, and I cannot yet make any statement as to the results.

GAOLS REPORT.

6. **Colonel WEDGWOOD** asked the Secretary of State for India when he expects that the Indian Gaols Report will be published; and will the evidence be also published?

Mr. MONTAGU: The Report has been formally presented, and I hope that copies will be available for distribution next week. The answer to the second part of the question is in the negative.

PENSIONS.

7. **Colonel WEDGWOOD** asked the Secretary of State for India how much is now contributed annually from the Indian Budget to each of the following: General Dyer, Sir Michael O'Dwyer, Colonel Frank Johnson, and Mr. Bosworth Smith; and will he approach the Chancellor of the Exchequer with a view to getting these charges transferred from the Indian to the British Budget?

Mr. MONTAGU: The figures are as follow:—Sir Michael O'Dwyer and Mr. Bosworth Smith, £1,000 and £900 respectively, of which a considerable portion represents funds contributed by the officers themselves; General Dyer, £900, of which approximately one-twelfth will be debitable, on adjustment, to British revenues on account of a period of service out of India. Colonel Johnson draws no pension from Indian

revenues. The answer to the last part of the question is in the negative.

ARMY REDUCTIONS.

8. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India what is the total number of cavalry regiments maintained by the various Powers in Europe, with the exception of Russia; and how does this number compare with the eight regiments of British cavalry and the 21 regiments of Indian cavalry of three squadrons each to which the Army in India is to be reduced, considering that India has practically the same area, the same population, and the same diversity of race and language as the whole of Europe without Russia?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have not the information upon which to base a comparison, nor does it seem to me worth while to obtain material with which to weigh together incomparable matters.

Sir C. YATE: Does the right hon. Gentleman not think it is absolutely impossible to hold an enormous country like India with 29 cavalry regiments?

Mr. MONTAGU: It does not seem to me that you can measure the military force necessary in one country by comparison with another country.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: Are we holding India with the Army?

Mr. MONTAGU: No.

9. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India whether the successful candidates at the competitive examination held in November, 1916, for admission to the Royal Military Academy, Woolwich, the Royal Military College, Sandhurst, and the Military College, Quetta, with a view to appointment to the Indian Army, and who are holding permanent commissions in the Indian Army, are now to be dismissed owing to the reductions in the Indian Army; and, if so, what compensation is to be given them to enable them to start on a new career?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have received no proposals for the dismissal of these officers.

Wednesday, 25th May, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

STORES DEPARTMENT, LONDON (PENSIONS).

32. **Mr. GILBERT** asked the Secretary of State for India whether any further steps have been taken by his Department to place all the employes engaged at the Indian Stores, Belvedere Road, S.E., upon a pension basis; and if such a scheme has been decided upon can he state the date when it will come into force?

Mr. PARKER (Lord of the Treasury): The High Commissioner, who now controls the India Store Depot, has agreed with representatives of the staff side of the National Whitley Council to place the bulk of the employes upon a pension basis, subject to certain modifications in their terms of employment. If these are accepted by the men concerned, the scheme will come into force as from 1st April last.

EDUCATIONAL SERVICE.

33. **Colonel Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India what was the proportion of appointments in the Indian Educational Service which the Public Services Commission recommended should be reserved for men recruited in England and in India, respectively; and what are the proportions existing at present?

Mr. PARKER: As regards the first part of the question, the recommendations of the Public Services Commission are somewhat complex, and my right hon. Friend would refer the hon. and gallant Member to their Report (Cd. 8382 of 1917, pp. 27 and 97). As regards the second part, exact figures relating to the country of recruitment are not available, but in March last the percentage of Europeans and Anglo-Indians in the Service was 65, and of Indians 35. Fifty per cent. of Indians has been sanctioned as the standard to be worked up to for India as a whole as qualified Indian candidates become available.

Tuesday, 31st May, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

AUXILIARY FORCE.

1. Colonel Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India if he can now state how many of the 32,000 men proposed for the Indian Auxiliary Force were voluntarily recruited up to 31st March last and, if the required numbers were not completed, what steps he proposes to take in the matter; and what was the maximum strength attained by the Indian Defence Force under the Compulsory Service Act?

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Montagu): Up to the 31st March, 22,603, and up to the 30th April, 23,925 men were attested in the Auxiliary Force, India. These totals exclude men who are enrolled but have not yet attested. The maximum strength attained by the Indian Defence Force, according to the records available, was 33,451 in October, 1920.

Sir C. YATE: What steps does the right hon. Gentleman propose to take to bring the numbers of the Auxiliary Force up to the numbers of the old Defence Force?

Mr. MONTAGU: I do not propose to take any steps. The matter is entirely in the hands of the Indian Government, who will make such recommendations as they may think fit, in view of the numbers enlisted.

Sir C. YATE: Is there any time limit for voluntary recruitment, or does it go on indefinitely?

Mr. MONTAGU: My hon. and gallant Friend will remember that we decided in the first instance to try voluntary enlistment. If voluntary enlistment be not a success, at any moment that the Government of India think that it is not, they may make recommendations for an alternative scheme.

CAVALRY (REDUCTIONS).

2. Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether, despite his assurance that no further reductions would be made in the Indian Army

pending the inquiry into the military requirements of India by a Sub-committee of the Committee of Imperial Defence, the Indian cavalry are being reduced from 39 regiments of four squadrons each to 21 regiments of three squadrons each, and orders are now being issued for the disbandment of the 35th Sikhs, 42nd Deoli Regiment, 43rd Erinpura Regiment, 44th Merwara Regiment, the 108th Infantry, and other pre-War regiments of the Indian Army; and whether he will countermand the orders for these reductions pending the result of the inquiry by the Sub-committee?

Mr. MONTAGU: As regards the cavalry, I would refer the hon. and gallant Member to the answer given in this House to his question of 3rd May on the same subject. In the case of the 44th Merwara Infantry, I have nothing to add to the answer which I gave on May 10th. Of the other infantry battalions mentioned, two are still serving overseas and two in India. As I stated in replying to a question by my hon. and gallant Friend on April 6th, reductions of units no longer required will take place as opportunity offers, but no reductions which would bring the Indian Army below the proposed post-War strength of 21 Indian cavalry regiments and 132 infantry and pioneer battalions will take place pending consideration of the whole matter by the Sub-committee of the Committee of Imperial Defence. Which particular units should be disbanded on becoming surplus to requirements is a question which must be left to the Government of India.

Sir C. YATE: Did not the right hon. Gentleman agree that no pre-War regiment should be disbanded until after the Committee had reported, and these are all pre-War regiments which are now being disbanded, much to the disappointment of the men in India?

Mr. MONTAGU: If my hon. and gallant Friend will refresh his memory, he will see that there is nothing inconsistent in anything which I have previously said with the answer that I have just given. The only regiment which I have described as being disbanded is the 44th Merwara Infantry. If he will refer to my answer of the 10th, he will find that explained.

BURMA, CONSTITUTION.

4. **Colonel WEDGWOOD** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware of the Burmese opposition to the Local Self-Government Bill now before the Burma Legislative Council; and whether he will have this measure postponed, as in most provinces of India, till after the grant of dyarchy to Burma, when local government will become a transferred subject?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have not yet received the proceedings of the Legislative Council relating to this Bill, and have seen no evidence of popular opposition to it.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: Does not the right hon. Gentleman get the Burmese papers, and has not he observed the opposition?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have not observed any popular opposition to it. If my hon. and gallant Friend has any observations to make, I shall be glad to receive them.

6. **Colonel WEDGWOOD** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he will lay Papers showing the correspondence between the Government of India and the India Office concerning the Burma constitution, which has been published in the Burma newspapers of 30th April?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am not quite sure what correspondence the hon. and gallant Member has in mind, but I gather that the correspondence recently published in Burma is that which was presented to Parliament on 11th March as Cmd. 1194.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: Can we have the subsequent correspondence between the Government of India and the India Office published, to complete the series of papers?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am afraid that I must look to see what correspondence there is before I can give any assurance.

SHWEDAGON PAGODA.

5. **Colonel WEDGWOOD** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he has yet any news to give as to the restoration of the west stepway to the trustees of the Shwedagon Pagoda, which has been so long under the consideration of the military authorities in Burma?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am informed that the relinquishment of the portion of the outer Pagoda precincts occupied by the military authorities is an integral part of a comprehensive scheme for the removal of the Cantonment of Rangoon to a site some 15 miles away. Definite proposals to this end are now in progress between the Government of India and the local authorities, but negotiations for the exchange of land are likely to take longer than I had anticipated. I am in communication with the Government of India on the subject.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that this question has now been under discussion for nearly three years. Can he give some assurance to the people of Burma that the Government do contemplate the earliest possible relinquishment of that site?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have already given an assurance on the matter to the House, but it is part of a larger scheme, and I am afraid that I cannot act until the scheme is complete.

OFFICERS' PAY (RUPEE EXCHANGE).

7. **Lieut.-Colonel Sir F. HALL** asked the Secretary of State for India when he will be able to state what steps are to be taken to remedy the present condition in India under which the rupee rates of pay of British service officers in India are less than the home rates of pay and allowances converted at the current rate of exchange?

Mr. MONTAGU: The question presents many difficulties. I regret to say no decision has yet been reached.

Sir F. HALL: Will the right hon. Gentleman take steps to get into communication with the Indian Government to see if some alteration cannot be made, seeing that the present position is so hard on British officers serving in India?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am in active communication with the Government of India, and a telegram from them is now under the consideration of my Council. I will do my best to get special consideration.

Sir F. HALL: If I put down a question in a fortnight, will the right hon. Gentleman be able to give me an answer?

Mr. MONTAGU: I very much hope so.

DEMobilISED OFFICERS.

10. **Sir C. YATE** had given notice of the following question: To ask the Secretary of State for India if he can state for what reason demobilised officers in India, who have been detained for so many weeks past at Deolali pending transport to England, have been compelled to sign a declaration that they would not hold the Government responsible in the event of accidents occurring out of the trooping season owing to hot weather risks; whether this declaration applies to the wives of the officers concerned; and what compensation is to be given to those officers who have been kept long after the expiration of their contract date at personal loss to themselves?

Mr. SPEAKER: Sir Charles Yate.

Sir C. YATE: Question No. 10 is postponed. If I put down the question again in a fortnight, will the right hon. Gentleman be able to give me an answer?

Mr. MONTAGU: I will telegraph to the Government of India. If my hon. and gallant Friend will put down the question in a fortnight and I have not a complete answer then, perhaps, he will be good enough to repeat it.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

SEDITIONOUS UTTERANCES (PROSECUTIONS).

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India how many persons have been prosecuted in India for seditious utterances in speeches or newspapers during the present year, and how many have been convicted; and how many prosecutions have been instituted for incitement to assault and riot, and with what result?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have asked by telegram for the figures, and will let my hon. and gallant Friend know when I receive them.

MILITARY ACCOUNTS.

Colonel WEDGWOOD asked the Secretary of State for India whether there is any audit of the military accounts in India similar to the audit of the civil accounts?

Mr. MONTAGU: The answer is in the affirmative.

Mr. GANDHI.

Viscount CURZON asked the Secretary of State for India how many times the Viceroy of India has officially received an individual called Gandhi; and whether he can make any statement as to the result of the interviews?

Mr. MONTAGU: The Viceroy has received Mr. Gandhi several times privately. The Viceroy will no doubt consider what statement, if any, could usefully be made in regard to these interviews.

Wednesday, 1st June, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

KUKI HILLS OPERATIONS (MEDAL).

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Indian frontier medal is to be granted for the operations in the Kuki Hills?

Mr. MONTAGU: The question of an award for the operations in the Kuki Hills is under consideration with the War Office, and it is hoped that a decision may be reached shortly.

ARMY OFFICERS (CONTINUED SERVICE).

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India what decision has been arrived at with the War Office regarding the adjustment of the pay of those officers of the Indian Army who were retained in the Army on account of the War beyond the date on which they became due to be placed on the retired list?

Mr. MONTAGU: I regret that I am not yet in a position to arrive at a decision.

TRIBAL RISINGS, 1919.

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India what was the total number of troops employed on the North-West Frontier of India in repelling the Afghan attack and the tribal risings during 1919?

Mr. MONTAGU: Sir Charles Monro's Despatch, published in the "London

Gazette" of 15th March, 1920, mentions that 340,000 men were at one time employed west of the Indus.

DEMILITARISABLE OFFICERS.

Mr. GWYNNE asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the fact that between 200 and 300 demobilised officers are waiting at Deolali, and in some cases have been waiting for three months, for passages to return to England; that they are quartered under canvas with no fans, or punkahs, or adequate furniture, and suffer great discomforts, and that in several cases officers who have situations to return to are in danger of losing them owing to this delay; and, in view of the statement made recently that the number of passages available each week exceeded the demand, will he have special inquiries made into this case and see that these officers are given facilities to get home immediately?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have already communicated with the Government of India regarding the delay in getting demobilisable officers home. Steps have been taken to secure every available berth on private steamers for these officers. I have now sent an inquiry to the Government of India regarding the conditions at Deolali camp, the result of which I will communicate to my hon. Friend.

Thursday, 2nd June, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

MICROSCOPES (AMERICAN CONTRACT).

Mr. R. YOUNG asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that encouragement has been given to dumping by his Department in that an order for microscopes has been given to an American firm at a price 20 per cent. below the price charged by the same firm in America; what is the name of the firm; how many British firms tendered to do this work who are on the King's Roll; what advantage does membership of the King's Roll confer; what is the value of the order given and what was the lowest British quotation; and do

microscopes come within the definition of optical instruments in the Key Industries Bill?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am informed by the High Commissioner for India, in whose province the matter lies, that an order for microscopes was recently given on behalf of the Indian Government to the English agent of an American firm. Tenders had also been invited from three English firms. The quotations were all referred to the Indenting Department in India, who selected the tender for the American microscopes. I am not aware that the price was 20 per cent. below that charged in America. The name of the manufacturers is the Spencer Lens Company, the English agents being Messrs. Standley Belcher and Mason. Tenders were received from two British firms, both of whom are on the King's Roll, as are also Messrs. Standley Belcher and Mason. It has been laid down that, except in very special circumstances, British Government Departments shall not place orders with firms that are not on the King's Roll. The value of the order given for Spencer Lens microscopes is £2,797. The lowest British quotation was £3,450. The question whether microscopes come within the definition of optical instruments in the Key Industries Bill should be addressed to my right hon. Friend the President of the Board of Trade.

Friday, 3rd June, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

COOLIES, ASSAM (UNREST).

Sir J. D. REES asked the Secretary of State for India whether he will give the House any information regarding unrest among coolies in Assam?

Mr. MONTAGU: I received a few days ago a report on this matter from the Government of India, and immediately issued a communiqué to the Press. The following is a copy of the communiqué:

COMMUNIQUE.

"A telegram from the Government of India, dated 26th May, has been received by

the India Office regarding a strike of tea gardens coolies in Chargola Valley, in Karimganj, a sub-division of Sylhet, in Assam. As the result of discussion between leading planters and the Divisional Commissioner, most managers announced an increase of wages. Thereupon many coolies returned to the gardens but some thousand of them gathered at Karimganj Railway Station for the purpose of travelling to their homes in the Central Provinces and United Provinces. Precautions have been taken by the local Government against disease and for protection of the destitute, but the local Government considers it impossible to repatriate able-bodied men, as this might cause an exodus elsewhere.

The Governor in Council has taken ordinary security measures.

Many coolies have arrived in Bengal and the local authorities have sent about 500 of them to Goalundo and the remainder to Asansol, where they were held up with cholera. Those infected were sent to a cholera camp. A second body of 950 coolies who came to Bengal were also sent to Goalundo, but on finding that the Bengal Government would not repatriate them walked towards Nihati. Many took to the railway on being provided with money collected locally. At Chandpur several cases of cholera are reported. Coolies rushed a mail steamer there on 21st May, assaulted a sub-divisional officer and a representative of the Tea Association. Over 300 of them got on the steamer and went to Goalundo. The Tea Association have sent representatives to try and induce the coolies to return to their work, but unsuccessfully. A later telegram, dated the 24th, from the Bengal Government, says that order has been restored at Chandpur after a certain amount of force had been used. Thirty coolies were injured, none of them seriously, and newspaper reports that coolies were drowned are false. Hartals are in progress at Chandpur, Chittagong and Comilla and are threatened in other towns. On the Assam Bengal Railway a general strike has begun, and there is a threat of a steamer strike.

According to the latest news from Assam the exodus had stopped, at any rate, for the time being."

Monday, 6th June, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

ARMY (RECONSTITUTION COMMITTEE).

27. Sir CHARLES TOWNSHEND asked the Prime Minister whether he will give the names of the Committee which is sitting on the reconstitution of the Indian Army?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: The composition of this Committee has not yet been finally decided, but in any event it would be contrary to the usual practice to announce the membership of a Committee of this nature.

GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS (PASSAGES).

52. Colonel Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India what has been the result of his communication with the Government of India with regard to the cheapening of the cost of passages of Government officials to and from India?

Mr. PARKER: My right hon. Friend hopes to give my hon. Friend a reply this day week.

CALCUTTA UNIVERSITY.

53. Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether he can give any information regarding the letter reported in the Indian Press to have been addressed by the Registrar of the Calcutta University to the Government of India, and as to what action has been taken by the latter in the matter?

Mr. PARKER: My right hon. Friend has seen in the Press the letter referred to by the hon. and gallant Member, but he is not informed as to the circumstances in which it was written or whether any reply to it has been made. He will inquire of the Government of India.

CIVIL SERVANTS (ARMY RESERVE OF OFFICERS).

54. Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether, considering that under Army Instruction, India, No. 790, dated 23rd July, 1918, it was decided that Government servants granted commissions in the Indian Army Reserve of Officers and Military Officers of the Indian Army in permanent civil employ on temporary military duty during the War should be given the option when serving overseas of retaining their civil salary according to the next below rule or of receiving the military pay and allowances of rank plus civil pay, whichever is greater, with retrospective effect from December, 1916, and that similar concessions were made to members of the home Civil Service who served overseas under the War Office, he will state whether a similar concession was refused in the case of servants of the Indian Government

who served overseas under the War Office; and, if so, for what reasons the concessions were refused?

Mr. PARKER: It was not originally intended that Indian Government servants who joined the Indian Army Reserve of Officers should serve outside India. Having joined the Reserve on this understanding they were entitled, when it became necessary for them to serve overseas, to receive not less pay than when serving in India, namely, their civil pay. There was no such understanding in the case of those who joined the British Service, and after very careful consideration my right hon. Friend has decided that there are not sufficient grounds for giving them their civil pay.

STATE RAILWAYS (STORES).

55. **Major KELLEY** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he exercises any control over the placing of orders by the Indian State railways; and, if so, has he considered the inadvisability, in the Imperial interests, of giving such orders to foreign companies, who, because of exchange conditions, can quote lower prices, and to pay unemployment doles to unemployed railway material workers in England?

Mr. PARKER: The purchase in this country of stores for Indian State railways is under the control of the High Commissioner for India, whose policy is to give full weight to the considerations urged by the hon. Member.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: Is it understood that India is entitled to buy in the cheapest market?

Mr. PARKER: That is the usual method in trade.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

INCOME TAX AND SUPER-TAX.

Sir G. COLLINS asked the Secretary of State for India the present rates of Income Tax and Super-income Tax levied in India?

Mr. MONTAGU: The information asked for is as follows:

Rates of Indian Income Tax.

(I) When the taxable income is less than Rs.2,000—Nil.

(II) When the taxable income is Rs.2,000 or upwards, and

(i) the total income is less than Rs.5,000—Five pies in the rupee;

(ii) the total income is Rs.5,000 or upwards, but is less than Rs.10,000—Six pies in the rupee;

(iii) the total income is Rs.10,000 or upwards, but is less than Rs.20,000—Nine pies in the rupee;

(iv) the total income is Rs.20,000 or upwards, but is less than Rs.30,000—One anna in the rupee;

(v) the total income is Rs.30,000 or upwards, but is less than Rs.40,000—One anna and two pies in the rupee;

(vi) the total income is Rs.40,000 or upwards—One anna and four pies in the rupee.

Rates of Indian Super-tax.

(1) In respect of the first lakh of rupees of taxable income—

(a) in the case of a Hindu undivided family—

(i) in respect of the first seventy-five thousand rupees of taxable income—Nil.

(ii) in respect of the next twenty-five thousand rupees of taxable income—One anna in the rupee.

(b) In all other cases—

(i) in respect of the first fifty thousand rupees of taxable income—Nil.

(ii) in respect of the next fifty thousand rupees of taxable income—One anna in the rupee.

(2) In respect of the first fifty thousand rupees of taxable income over one lakh of rupees—One-and-a-half annas in the rupee.

(3) In respect of the next fifty thousand rupees of taxable income—Two annas in the rupee.

(4) In respect of the next fifty thousand rupees of taxable income—Two-and-a-half annas in the rupee.

(5) In respect of the next fifty thousand rupees of taxable income—Three annas in the rupee.

(6) In respect of the next fifty thousand rupees of taxable income—Three-and-a-half annas in the rupee.

(7) In respect of all taxable income over three-and-a-half lakhs of rupees—Four annas in the rupee.

Tuesday, 7th June, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

ARMY OFFICERS (PENSIONS).

4. Colonel Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether a decision has now been arrived at on the subject of the additional pensions of £100 and £200 a year which it was stated in the India Office memorandum of the 3rd June, 1920, would be granted to officers of the Indian Army on the supernumerary list who had held high civil appointments?

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Montagu): I have not yet arrived at a decision, but hope to do so shortly.

Sir C. YATE: A whole year has expired since the announcement was first made. Can the right hon. Gentleman say when I may expect an answer?

Mr. MONTAGU: I can assure my hon. and gallant Friend that everything possible is being done to expedite a decision; but these questions necessitate constant reference to India, and that must take some time.

5. Mr. RENDALL asked the Secretary of State for India whether it is a rule that a wife of a retired officer of the Indian Army who is the innocent party in a divorce suit and divorces her husband, thereby deprives herself of any pension under Indian Military Service Family Pension Fund rules which, under ordinary circumstances, she would be entitled to on the death of her husband; and will he have the Regulations so amended as to permit of a divorced officer continuing, if he so desires, his

subscriptions to the fund in question so that the wife who divorced him may not lose the benefits thereof?

Mr. MONTAGU: The answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. Only the person who becomes by law the officer's widow is entitled to pension under the Regulations. The question of the loss of contingent benefits under the Regulations by a wife who is the innocent party in a divorce suit was raised in the Report of the Esher Committee, and is receiving special consideration.

6. Mr. RENDALL asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware of the injustice suffered by officers of the Indian Army who, having retired on pension and having had the misfortune to be involved in marital unhappiness, can, on the strength of a paragraph in Indian Army Regulations, have that pension, which they have earned by long and faithful service to the State, arbitrarily withheld on the mere statement of their wives, without their being afforded a chance to be heard in their defence; and whether Colonel J. C. P. Hennessy, C.M.G., I.A., retired, was deprived of the means of living by his pension being withheld for six months or more because his wife complained at the India Office that he had deserted her and left her without allowance for three years, which statement was subsequently proved to be without foundation?

Mr. MONTAGU: The Regulation referred to by the hon. Member reserves to Government the right to withhold the pension of an officer, if he is guilty of grave misconduct. I am not aware that injustice has been suffered by any officer of the Indian Army under the Regulation referred to, which is brought into operation very rarely, and then only after the most careful consideration. Colonel Hennessy's pension was provisionally withheld pending his reply to the charges made against him, which was delayed owing to his being in East Africa. But no final decision was taken until his reply had been fully considered.

AUXILIARY FORCE.

7. Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether, considering that only 23,000 men have been voluntarily attested in the Indian Auxiliary Force out

of the total strength of 33,000 attained by the Indian Defence Force, and in view of his statement on 14th July, 1920, that the first necessity was to produce an adequate defence force in India, and, if voluntary methods did not secure it, he would have no hesitation in recommending His Majesty's Government to take compulsory measures, he will now remove the veto he placed on the Bill brought in by the Government of India for the establishment of an Indian Defence Force and permit the Government of India to proceed with the measure which they considered necessary?

Mr. MONTAGU: I will inquire whether the Government of India recommend any change in the method of recruiting for the Auxiliary Force.

ARMY REDUCTIONS.

8. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India whether, considering that Sir Charles Monro, late Commander-in-Chief in India, in his despatch published in the "London Gazette" of 15th March, 1920, mentions that 340,000 men were at one time employed west of the Indus in repelling the Afghan invasion and the tribal risings on the North-West frontier of India in 1919, that peace has not yet been signed with Afghanistan, and the tribal risings still continue, it is still proposed to proceed with the reduction of the pre-War Indian cavalry by 93 squadrons, and also of various pre-War infantry regiments, as well as of all battalions raised during the War, especially after his assurance of the 23rd March, 1921, that no further reductions would be made pending the inquiry into the military requirements of India by a sub-committee of the Committee of Imperial Defence?

Mr. MONTAGU: The Commander-in-Chief has submitted and the Government of India have accepted proposals for the establishments and the numbers of units in each arm which are to be maintained in India. These proposals are based upon a detailed examination of what is required for the defence of India, and the resultant numbers are those given by me previously in this House, namely, 21 Indian cavalry regiments and 132 infantry and pioneer battalions. I can only once more assure my hon. and gallant Friend that no reductions will be made at present which would bring the number of units below these submitted by the Commander-in-

Chief, and accepted by the Government of India in the circumstances described.

Sir C. YATE: If 340,000 men were required a couple of years ago to defend the Indian frontier, how is it safe now to reduce the Indian Army to something like 130,000 men?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have given the figures often in answers in this House. As the hon. and gallant Gentleman well knows, the whole subject is about to be referred to the Committee of Imperial Defence; and until a decision varying the numbers is come to by the Committee they will stand.

Sir C. YATE: Will the right hon. Gentleman stop the reduction of the Army at the present time which is doing so much harm throughout India—will he stop that pending the decision of the Conference?

Mr. MONTAGU: I cannot stop decisions already accepted. These were accepted on the recommendation of the Commander-in-Chief, and will be maintained.

Sir C. YATE: Is it not suicidal to reduce the Army to this extent?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is entering into argument.

MR. GANDHI.

10. **Captain Viscount CURZON** asked the Secretary of State for India whether, as an individual called Gandhi has stated publicly that the Viceroy of India is probably sympathetic to the non-co-operation movement, he can now give any account of the matter discussed at the recent interview with the individual alluded to?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have seen no such statement. It is difficult to believe it was ever made and impossible to believe that anyone would believe it if made. The answer to the last part of the question is that I have nothing to add to the answer I gave last week.

Viscount CURZON: In view of the fact that there is in most of the English Press accounts of these interviews, could the right hon. Gentleman not possibly give some authoritative account of the discussions that actually took place so as to put an end to the rumours?

Mr. MONTAGU: I do not think so. When the Governor-General accords an interview for informal discussion, it is not customary to keep a record or publish an account of what takes place. As I have said, if His Excellency desires to publish any account of these discussions he will do so.

Viscount CURZON: Has the right hon. Gentleman not noticed that the man alluded to is now going about giving what purports to be an account of these interviews, and would it not be much better to state exactly what did take place than allow the account to be one-sided and come from unofficial sources?

Mr. MONTAGU: I do not know to what the Noble Lord refers. On the contrary, I have heard that Mr. Gandhi is honourably fulfilling the conditions under which these private interviews took place.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE, MADRAS.

Colonel WEDGWOOD asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Madras Legislature has voted in favour of women's suffrage?

Mr. MONTAGU: I regret that, owing to delay in publication of the official reports of the debates of the Madras Legislative Council, I cannot give a more definite answer to this question than I gave to a similar one by the hon. Baronet the Member for East Nottingham (Sir J. D. Rees) on 3rd May.

POLITICAL PRISONERS.

Mr. SPOOR asked the Secretary of State for India how many Indians are at the present time confined for political offences in the penal settlement in the Andamans; and how many are confined in other penal establishments in India?

Mr. MONTAGU: I understand that there are 47 in the Andamans; and in February the Government of India stated that there were 101 altogether. There are presumably 54 in gaols in India.

DIVORCE DECREES.

Mr. D. HERBERT asked the Lord Privy Seal when it is intended to introduce the proposed Bill to validate certain

divorce decrees made by the Indian Courts, and which, under a recent decision of the Divorce Court in this country, are at present invalid?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have been asked to answer this question. A Bill was introduced in another place last week.

SENTENCE FOR SEDITION (SWAMI GOVIND ANAND).

Sir J. D. REES asked the Secretary of State for India what were the circumstances attending the trial of Swami Govind Anand, at Karachi; and what was the result of the trial?

Mr. MONTAGU: The Swami was a leading non-co-operator of Karachi. He was charged, in the middle of April, with sedition and with acting so as to cause enmity between different classes of His Majesty's subjects. But I have no detailed information as to what he had said or done. He was convicted and sentenced to five years' imprisonment.

BEHAR AND ORISSA (VILLAGE SELF-GOVERNMENT).

Sir J. D. REES asked the Secretary of State for India whether he has information to the effect that an Act similar to the Bengal Village Self-Government Act of 1919 is to be introduced in the Legislative Council of the province of Behar and Orissa?

Mr. MONTAGU: This question rests with the Governor and his Ministers, and I have not received any statement of their intentions.

STUDENTS (BRITISH INDUSTRIES).

Captain GEE asked the Secretary of State for India if students from India are compelled to enter mills and factories on the Continent of Europe and in the United States of America owing to lack of facilities in the United Kingdom; and, in view of the above facts, will he consider the advisability of obtaining facilities for Indian students to enter British mills and factories?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am aware that there have been certain difficulties in obtaining in this country the facilities referred to in the question. A Committee, under the chairmanship of Lord Lytton, is now sitting to consider the whole question of the position of Indian students in this country, and this matter is included in the terms of reference.

Thursday, 9th June, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

GAOLS COMMITTEE (EVIDENCE).

Mr. SPOOR asked the Secretary of State for India when Volumes 2, 3, 4 and 5 of the Report of the Indian Gaols Committee, 1919-20, containing the minutes of evidence, will be published?

Mr. MONTAGU: As stated in reply to the hon. and gallant Member for Newcastle-under-Lyme (Colonel Wedgwood) on the 24th May, it is not proposed to publish the evidence given before the Committee.

PUBLICITY DEPARTMENTS, BENGAL AND PUNJAB.

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India what are the steps that have been taken by the Punjab and other Governments in India in which the council have refused to sanction the Budget grant for the publicity department to supply the public with accurate information?

Mr. MONTAGU: The only provinces in which the councils have refused provision for publicity departments are Bengal and the Punjab. In Bengal, according to my information, the work was only in the experimental stage; in that province the Press is active and all shades of opinion are represented in it. I presume that the procedure as to communiqués and information to the Press is now as it was before the experiment was started. In the Punjab the provision was disallowed only on the 12th March, and a week later the Legislative Council voted a sum sufficient to wind up the Publicity Board with due notice to those employed in it. The Government is itself issuing communiqués.

ROYAL ENGINEERS (OFFICERS' PAY).

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether majors in the Royal Engineers in India of less than five years' service are now drawing under the revised rate of pay as laid down in A.I.I. 425 of 1920, R. 1,200 per mensem, whereas their rate of pay before the War was R. 1,130 plus exchange compensation allowance 75 rupees, or a total of R. 1,205; whether these revised rates of pay of officers in India, which were supposed to

afford temporary relief to the officers concerned were based on a 2s. rupee; and now that the rupee has fallen to 1s. 3d. what exchange compensation or other allowance is to be granted to these officers to compensate them for the loss of so much of their income?

Mr. MONTAGU: It is the case that for a major of less than 5 years' service the new pay is 10 annas—not five rupees—less than before. It is due to a more even progressive grading, for at both earlier and later stages the new pay is considerably higher than the old. The new scales of pay were intended to be rupee scales not based on any special exchange value, and while I sympathise with the loss inflicted on officers by the present low exchange, which I hope may be only temporary, they benefit when a higher rate prevails. I am afraid I cannot hold out any expectation of a reversion to the system of exchange compensation allowance.

STERLING LOAN.

Mr. S. ROBERTS asked the Secretary of State for India whether, when sanction is given for the Indian Government to raise money in England on loan, any stipulation is made that the money so raised is spent here; how much of the £7,500,000 recently borrowed for railway material has been spent in this country; whether it is intended to spend any part of this amount in foreign countries; and, if so, for what reasons?

Mr. MONTAGU: It was stated on the prospectus issued in connection with the recent Indian sterling loan that the entire proceeds would be utilised for the purchase of railway material in the United Kingdom and no part of the loan proceeds will therefore be expended abroad. About £900,000 was spent in this country in May last on railway capital account.

Monday, 13th June, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIAN ARMY (BANDS).

70. Colonel Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India the result of his inquiry from the Government of India as to the upkeep in future of regimental bands in the Indian Army and how far the

[Sir C. Yate.]

cost of these bands is to be dependent on subscriptions deducted from the officers' pay?

Mr. PARKER (Lord of the Treasury, for **Mr. Montagu**): The Government of India have certain proposals under consideration, and a decision should be reached shortly.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

MADRAS MILITARY FUND.

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India what sum the assets of the Madras Military Fund amounted to when taken over by the Government in 1862, when the fund was closed to future entrants; and whether the increased interest now being obtained on that sum is sufficiently high to warrant an increase of 25 per cent. to all remaining annuitants on that fund, the same as has already been granted to pensioners under the Indian Military Service Family Pension Fund?

Mr. MONTAGU: The Madras Military Fund, although closed to future entrants in 1862, was not transferred to Government until 1866, when the assets of the Fund amounted to £1,211,611. This amount, with interest thereon, was exhausted many years ago in making good the excess of payments in respect of pensions over receipts from subscribers; and this excess already averaged over £140,000 a year before the recent increase of 25 per cent. was granted as an act of grace in the lower rates of pension. I cannot see my way to authorise any further concession at the expense of Indian revenues.

POLICE CONSTABLES AND VILLAGE WATCHMEN (PAY).

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India what is the pay per mensem of a police constable in the various provinces of India; whether that pay is considered sufficient by the Governments concerned to maintain a loyal and contented police service; what is the pay of the village watchmen in the different provinces; and whether any steps have been taken of late years to improve their position?

Mr. MONTAGU: The monthly pay of police constables varies in the different provinces between extreme limits of Rs. 13 and Rs. 24, and account has in addition to be taken of a number of allowances of different kinds. I shall be glad to send the hon. and gallant Member a statement compiled from the most recent information with the Government of India. The rates were recently revised in almost every province with reference to present-day conditions and in accordance with recommendations from local Governments for raising pay to the level required to maintain the police in an efficient and contented condition. As regards village watchmen, they are paid by different authorities in the several parts of India. In some, for instance—Madras and the United Provinces—they are paid by the Government. In Madras last year there were over 35,400 of them, and they cost Rs. 16,82,000, which indicates a pay of not more than Rs. 4 a month. In the United Provinces there are nearly 88,000. They receive only Rs. 3 a month, but even so they cost 32 lakhs a year. In that province the numbers are to be reduced and small improvements in pay are being made at an additional cost of 3 lakhs a year. In other provinces, for instance—Bengal and Bihar—village watchmen are paid from a special cess levied for the express purpose by local bodies, and any increase in their pay involves an addition to the assessments made by these bodies. Such an addition is necessarily unpopular, and there is a provision in the law limiting the rates of pay to a maximum of Rs. 6 a month. But both these Governments have the matter under consideration.

Tuesday, 14th June, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

DEMobilISED OFFICERS.

1. **Colonel Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India for what reason demobilised officers in India, who have been detained for so many weeks past at Deolali pending transport to England, have been compelled to sign a

declaration that they would not hold the Government responsible in the event of accidents occurring out of the trooping season owing to hot weather risks; whether this declaration applies to the wives of the officers concerned; and what compensation is to be given to those officers who have been kept long after the expiration of their contract date at personal loss to themselves?

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Montagu): The declaration was adopted at the instance of the War Office. It does not apply to officers, but only to their families, and is analogous to the undertaking required by the War Office from families going to India from this country. I am considering proposals of the Government of India as to the treatment of officers who may have suffered hardship in this connection, and hope to come to a decision shortly.

SPEECHES (Mr. ANDREWS).

4. Lieut.-Colonel Sir F. HALL asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the seditious speeches which a Mr. Andrews is delivering in India; whether this person is a British subject and amenable to British law; and whether he will consider as to arranging for Andrews to be sent back to England with a view to his being placed on trial on a charge of sedition?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have seen a Press report of parts of a speech made by Mr. Andrews. I am not prepared to express an opinion as to whether it comes within the scope of the criminal law. Mr. Andrews is a British subject. If a British subject commit an offence in India, the Courts in India are the proper authorities for trying the case.

Sir F. HALL: Does my right hon. Friend recognise that the stirring up of strife is likely to increase if people of British nationality are permitted to make these seditious speeches and no official notice is taken of them; and will the right hon. Gentleman communicate with the authorities in India with a view to ensuring a cessation of the activities of this so-called gentleman?

Mr. MONTAGU: I must leave the necessary steps for the preservation of order in India to the Government of India and the local governments.

ARMY REDUCTIONS AND EXPENDITURE.

5. Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether the proposal for the establishment and the number of units of the Indian Army in each arm of the service to be maintained in India, namely, 21 cavalry regiments and 132 infantry battalions, are based upon what was required by the Commander-in-Chief in India for the defence of India, namely, the 340,000 men employed for that purpose during the operations in 1919, or on the present demands of the Finance Department of the Government of India for reduction without consideration for the necessities of the defence of India; what is the total gross revenue of India, including the receipts both of the Government of India and of all the different Provinces; what is the proposed military expenditure after the proposed reductions in the Indian Army have been carried out; and what percentage does that expenditure bear to the gross revenue of British India?

Mr. MONTAGU: As regards the first part of the hon. and gallant Member's question, I regret that I can add nothing to the reply given in this House on 7th June, in which I informed him that the proposals were submitted by the Commander-in-Chief and based upon a detailed examination of what is required for the defence of India. The proposed military expenditure is 62.20 crores. The figures for the gross revenue of all the Provinces have not yet been received, so that I regret I cannot at present say what percentage of the gross revenue the proposed military expenditure represents. If my hon. and gallant Friend wishes it I will obtain the figures for which he has asked, but I would take this opportunity of pointing out that a more satisfactory comparison would probably be that between the proposed military expenditure and the net revenue of the Government of India.

Sir C. YATE: Can the right hon. Gentleman say when he will have the figures?

Mr. MONTAGU: If my hon. Friend will tell me which figures he prefers, I will communicate with the Government of India, and try to get them.

Sir C. YATE: The gross figures, both for the Government of India and the provinces.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

GOVERNMENT 7 PER CENT. LOAN.

Sir W. PRESTON asked the Secretary of State for India whether the entire proceeds of the recent 7 per cent. Government of India Loan will be utilised for the purchase of railway material in the United Kingdom in accordance with the promise contained in the prospectus advertised when the loan was issued?

Mr. MONTAGU: Yes, Sir.

MR. SATYAMURTI.

Colonel WEDGWOOD asked the Secretary of State for India whether, and, if so, why Mr. Satyamurti has been prohibited from visiting the Native Indian State of Puddacotta?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have seen references to an Order issued by the Rajah of Pudukota prohibiting the entry into or residence in the State of Mr. Satyamurti; but I have not seen the text of the Order, or received any official report on the subject, and cannot therefore give precise information.

Wednesday, 15th June, 1921.

EAST INDIA (FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND BUDGET).

Address for "Return of the Indian Financial Statement and Budget for 1921-22, and discussions thereon in the Indian Legislature (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 103, of 1920)." — [Mr. Montagu.]

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

ARMY, STRENGTH.

94. Colonel Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India what is to be the total strength of the 21 cavalry regiments and 132 infantry battalions to

which the Indian Army is to be reduced; and what percentage will that strength bear to the total population of India?

Mr. PARKER (Lord of the Treasury, for Mr. Montagu): The total strength of the 21 cavalry regiments and 132 infantry and pioneer battalions amounts to 117,670 Indian ranks, being a percentage of '0457 of the population of British India. It may, however, be pertinent to remark that the Army in India does not consist of cavalry and infantry alone, and that the total of the Indian fighting personnel provided for in the Government of India's Estimates of Military Expenditure for the year 1921-22 is 145,376, besides 44,003 reservists.

98. Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India the names of the officers who formed the committee to decide the constitution of the 21 cavalry regiments and 132 infantry battalions to which it is proposed that the Indian Army should be reduced to?

Mr. PARKER: My right hon. Friend regrets that he is not able to give the names of the officers comprising the committee on the cavalry and infantry, respectively, without inquiry from India.

CIVIL SERVICE.

95. Sir W. DAVISON asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware of the discontent existing in the Indian Civil Service by reason of the fact that improvements in pay and pension granted to the home Civil Service have not been applied to the Civil Service in India; whether he has recently received a telegram on behalf of the Indian Civil Service emphasising certain grievances; and what reply has been sent to the same?

Mr. PARKER: My right hon. Friend has received a number of memorials on the subjects mentioned, as well as the particular telegram referred to. The representations contained in the latter are, he understands, being formally submitted to him through the Government of India. He has, however, taken note of them in reaching decisions which he has recently communicated to the Government of India, who, as a result of those decisions, may be expected to issue a comprehensive Resolution almost imme-

diately dealing with the pay of the Imperial Indian Services, including the Indian Civil Service. Consideration of other matters, in particular, pensions, is still proceeding.

OFFICIALS (PASSAGES).

97. Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India if he can now state the result of his communication with the Government of India with regard to the cheapening of the cost of passages of Government officials to and from India?

Mr. PARKER: The Government of India are consulting Provincial Governments, and expect to be able to reply shortly as to whether they will take action to assist passage of Government officials.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

ARMY OFFICERS, MESOPOTAMIA (INCOME TAX).

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether Income Tax is deducted from the pay of Indian Army officers serving in Mesopotamia?

Lieut.-Colonel STANLEY: My right hon. Friend has asked me to reply. Indian Army officers in Mesopotamia drawing their Indian Army rates of pay are assessed at the Indian rates of Income Tax.

ARMY OFFICERS, JAPAN (EXCHANGE CONCESSIONS).

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India what arrangements have been made to meet the financial difficulties of the officers of the Indian Army studying Japanese in Japan owing to their salaries being inadequate at the present rate of exchange?

Mr. MONTAGU: In December last special exchange concessions were sanctioned for these officers. The need for further concessions is at present under discussion with the War Office and Admiralty, who are also concerned.

PRISON ADMINISTRATION.

Mr. R. RICHARDSON asked the Secretary of State for India whether he will instruct the Government of India to appoint a joint committee of the Council of

State and Legislative Assembly to consider what can be done to put the prison administration on a more humane footing?

Mr. MONTAGU: I propose to await the Government of India's opinions on the Report of the Jails Committee as a whole.

DEMOBILISED OFFICERS (PASSAGES).

Mr. HOGGE asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the comments made in the Indian Press by demobilised officers detained in India, he can take any steps to remove their grievances?

Mr. MONTAGU: Yes, Sir. In reply to a question by the hon. and gallant Member for Melton (Sir C. Yate), I stated on the 18th April that I understood that the Government of India had telegraphed two months previously that the accommodation on troopships exceeded the demand by 1,000 berths. I added that if the hon. and gallant Member could let me have particulars and any recent details I would make inquiries. At the time that I gave this reply I was not aware that the position had unexpectedly become worse during the period of two months to which I referred. The trooping arrangements are made between the War Office and the Government of India who were in direct correspondence on the subject. This correspondence did not come before my notice, and I regret that my answer, though strictly correct as far as it went, conveyed the impression that the position was better than it actually was. The facts were, however, brought to my notice and inquiry was made of the Government of India within a few days. They had already taken steps to meet the situation by engaging all the available steamship passages from Indian ports. There is every reason to think all the officers in question, and their families, will all have been provided with passages very shortly.

Thursday, 16th June, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

POLICE FORCE, BENGAL.

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has

been called to the statement in the Bengalee newspaper of 4th May that 38 dacoities, or robbery with violence by armed gangs, took place in Bengal during the first fortnight in April; what steps have been taken to strengthen the police force in Bengal, and has he any evidence indicating that this great outbreak is due to the expressed intention of the Legislative Council to reduce the police?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have no corroboration of the statement in the "Bengali" newspaper, but the figures quoted do not, I think, represent any substantial increase on the statistics of recent years. I have not heard that future reinforcement is thought necessary or contemplated. The second part of the question, in view of these facts, does not arise, but I would remind my hon. and gallant Friend that the budget grant for the police was finally passed by the Legislative Council with only minor alterations.

PUBLIC SERVICES (PENSION RULES).

Lieut.-Colonel CROFT asked the Secretary of State for India whether a Public Works officer who elects to come under the revised Indian Pension Rules will, on completing 25 years' service, be at a great disadvantage in comparison with the officer who chooses to remain under the old Rules, as the former, whilst earning only the same pension, is liable on attaining 25 years' service to have his services dispensed with at any time without any reason being given and without receiving any compensation and will only be allowed to retire by permission of the Government, whereas the officer who remains under the old Rules may be removed only for inefficiency or misconduct and can retire whenever he desires?

Mr. MONTAGU: I would refer my hon. and gallant Friend to the answer I gave the hon. Member for Cambridge University (Mr. Rawlinson) on 20th May, 1920. Officers in service on 29th August, 1919, had the option of accepting the new pension rules or coming under the old. The new rules grant higher rates of pension after 25 years' service, as well as higher additional pensions, but Government reserved the right to place a man on the retired list at or after 25 years' service.

Lieut.-Colonel CROFT asked the Secretary of State for India whether, seeing that the average expectation of any officer in respect of length of service at which

he will reach administrative rank is about 23 years, and that the benefits of the new rules, which consist of enhanced pensions to administrative officers and officers of between 25 and 30 years' service, do not apply to officers retiring or retired before or at this period, he will consider increasing the revised scales to meet the case of officers retiring up to and on completing 25 years' service?

Mr. MONTAGU: I would remind my hon. and gallant Friend that the recent increases of pensions were granted on the recommendations of the Government of India based on the report of the Public Services Commission. I do not see my way to reopen the question.

Lieut.-Colonel CROFT asked the Secretary of State for India, in view of the fact that the revised scale of pensions recently introduced for the officers of the Public Works Department, India, was introduced on account of the increased cost of living, why no increase whatever in pensions has been granted to those officers who have elected to remain under the old terms in preference to accepting the new terms?

Mr. MONTAGU: The increase in pensions referred to is part of the new terms. If an officer elect to remain under the old terms, he obviously cannot get the advantages of the new.

Lieut.-Colonel CROFT asked the Secretary of State for India, whether before the services of an officer of the Indian services could be dispensed with on the reduction of establishment in the past the appointment which the officer held had to be abolished and every endeavour made to obtain other suitable employment for the officer; whether the Civil Service Regulations lay down that the selection of the officer to be discharged should be *prima facie* so made that the least charge for compensation pension will be incurred; and, if so, whether he is prepared to qualify the statement he made in the House on 7th June, 1920, in as much as it seems clear that the Government did not always possess the power to dispense with the services of any particular officer for the purpose of reducing the establishment?

Mr. MONTAGU: As regards the first part of the question, the Regulation to

which my hon. and gallant Friend presumably refers runs as follows:

"A compensation pension is awarded to an officer discharged from the public service because, on a reduction of establishment, his appointment is abolished and other suitable employment cannot be found for him."

The answer to the second part is in the affirmative. As regards the third part, my answer of the 7th June, 1920, was correct in respect of officers who had completed the necessary term of service for pension, to whom the hon. Member for Cambridge University was referring. Government has never asserted its intention to exercise a right to dismiss an officer who has not earned his pension merely for the purpose of reducing the establishment.

Friday, 17th June, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

GOVERNMENT STAFFS.

INDIA OFFICE.

Mr. SPOOR asked the Secretary of State for India how many officials in his Department at present receive a salary of £1,000 or over; and how many received such salaries in June, 1914?

Mr. MONTAGU: The number of officials in my Department and in the India Audit Office at present receiving a salary of £1,000 or over is 25. The number of such officials in June, 1914, was 23.

Monday, 20th June, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

ARMY CADETS (SELECTION).

79. Colonel Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the statement in the Press that at the passing-out examination for the cadets at the Royal

Military College, Camberley, the last 10 on the list are now made to take commissions in the Indian Army, and that it used to be the other way about, the Indian Army being considered one of the plums of the service, and commissions in it could only be obtained by picked cadets who passed high out of the Royal Military College; and, if this is so, can he give any explanation of the change?

Lieut.-Colonel Sir J. GILMOUR (for Mr. Montagu): My right hon. Friend's attention has been called to the newspaper paragraph referred to, and he has taken steps to have it contradicted. He would refer my hon. and gallant Friend to his reply to him on 23rd March. Selection for the Indian Army is, of course, purely voluntary. The second, fourth, fifth and sixth on the list, among others, all chose the Indian Army.

NON-CO-OPERATION MOVEMENT.

80. Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to a statement in the Indian Press that so-called arbitration courts have been established in India in pursuance of the non-co-operation movement, and that the members of such a court at Jainagar, in the Durbhanga district of Bengal, inflicted on a woman the sentence of having her head shaved and her face painted with tar and lime; and, if so, can he state what steps have been taken by the Government of India to put an end to these unconstitutional tribunals, and to punish the men composing them?

Sir J. GILMOUR: My right hon. Friend has not seen a report of the case referred to. Arbitration is not in itself unconstitutional, and arbitrators' decisions in civil cases may be enforced in civil Courts if the parties accepted the arbitration, even if they resorted to arbitration on their own initiative and not at the instance of any Court. But if any person acting or professing to act as an arbitrator causes bodily harm to another, he is liable to prosecution in the ordinary course for a breach of the criminal law.

Sir C. YATE: Have these men been prosecuted?

Sir J. GILMOUR: I have no information on that point.

PUBLICITY OFFICES.

81. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the article in the Allahabad "Pioneer Mail" of the 20th May, entitled, Public Information in India; and, considering that the publicity organisations previously existing have been abolished in the Punjab and Bengal by the votes of the local Legislatures, and those in other provinces are said to be starved in resources and cold-shouldered by the Administration, he will suggest to the Government of India the desirability of following the example of the French Government in the matter, as advocated by the "Pioneer," and of doing their best to give life to the movement in favour of better information for the people?

Sir J. GILMOUR: My right hon. Friend has seen the article referred to. He does not accept as correct the statement that publicity offices in India have been starved in resources and cold-shouldered by the Administration. On the contrary, most local governments have been actively supporting them. I have already communicated to the Government of India my views as to the importance of the work.

Tuesday, 21st June, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

OFFICERS' PAY AND ALLOWANCES.

1. **Lieut.-Colonel Sir F. HALL** asked the Secretary of State for India when he will be able to state what steps are to be taken to remedy the present condition in India under which the rupee rates of pay of British service officers in India are less than the home rates of pay and allowances converted at the current rate of exchange?

5. **Lieut.-Colonel CROFT** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that there is a feeling of discontent amongst all British service officers in India on account of the new rate of pay having been fixed on the assumption that the rupee was not going to fall below a 2s. rate; whether the

Civil Service are at present drawing over 8 per cent. on their pay as exchange compensation; whether exchange compensation was given to military officers for two months and was then withdrawn and a refund demanded; and why exchange compensation is granted to the Civil Service and is denied to serving military officers?

6. **Colonel Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the statement in the Indian Press of 29th April that a married officer of the British service in India of about 10 years' service finds himself just over £100 worse off than an officer in similar circumstances at home; and whether the Government of India will now grant to all British married officers of the Army in India the same allowances that have been granted to married officers of the British Army at home?

18. **Major McMICKING** asked the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that, owing to the fall in the exchange value of the rupee, married British service officers in India are in a worse position financially than when serving at Home; whether the exchange value of the rupee was approximately 2s. when Army Instruction (India), No. 914, dated 21st October, 1919, was issued; and whether action will be taken to safeguard the financial position of all British service officers in India?

The **SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Montagu):** Owing to the fall in exchange, the sterling value of the rupee pay of certain classes of British service officers in India is at present less than the home rates. I have considered the various suggestions made to meet the situation, and have consulted the Government of India. They do not recommend the adoption of any of them, and, given a good monsoon, there is reason to hope for an improvement in exchange. I have considered their views most carefully in Council, and concur in their decision.

Major McMICKING: Were the Government, when they sanctioned the new rates of pay in 1919, guided by the rate of exchange current at that time?

Mr. MONTAGU: I cannot say that off-hand. Of course, the hon. and gallant Gentleman knows that the exchange has

fluctuated in a way that nobody could have foreseen some years ago.

Major McMICKING: Is it not the case as regards the pay of British non-commissioned officers and men that the value of the rupee is calculated at a fixed rate in sterling?

Mr. MONTAGU: Yes.

Major McMICKING: If that be so in respect to non-commissioned officers and men, why cannot the same principle be applied to officers.

Mr. MONTAGU: Perhaps my hon. and gallant Friend will put down a question on that subject, and I will give him a considered reply.

NEWSPAPERS (GWALIOR STATE).

8. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the statement in the "Leader" newspaper, of Allahabad, that the Gwalior State has prohibited the sale and distribution within the territory of His Highness the Maharaja of the following newspapers: the "Kesari," "Amrita Bayar Patrika," "Mahratta," "Bombay Chronicle," "Independent," "Pratap," "Rajasthan," and "Sahasa," and, considering that these papers are published in British India, will he state what action has been taken by the Government of India against these newspapers in support of the loyal action of His Highness the Maharaja; whether the Government of India has accepted the resolution of the Legislative Assembly to appoint a committee to examine the Indian Press Act of 1910, and to recommend modifications of the existing law in regard to liberty of speech and writing; and, if so, will the Press Act Committee consider the views of Indian princes in the matter of granting further freedom to the Press in India?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have seen a reference in the Indian newspapers to the Gwalior Prohibition. The Governments in British India have not, to my knowledge, taken any steps recently against the papers named. The Committee appointed to consider the Press laws has finished its sittings, and is on the point of presenting its report. The Committee took into consideration the connection between the Press laws and the native States.

CIVIL SERVICES (PENSIONS).

9. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the widespread desire expressed in the Indian Press amongst the members of the Civil Services of India to take advantage of the proposals of the Government of India, in their letter of 5th March, 1919, regarding proportional pensions for those to whom service under the reform scheme is not congenial, but who cannot apply for permission to retire till they know the conditions of retirement that will be open to them; and will he therefore now inform the Government of India of the pensions considered by him to be suitable to the various periods of service, as recommended in Clause 36 of the Report of the Joint Select Committee of 17th November, 1919?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have seen correspondence in the Press. The whole question has for some time been engaging the attention of my Council and myself, in consultation with the Government of India, but is not yet finally settled.

Sir C. YATE: When will it be finally settled?

Mr. MONTAGU: I hope in the course of the next week or so. I recognise it is a very urgent question, and am doing my best to expedite it.

Sir C. YATE: I will put down another question.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

LAND REVENUE.

Mr. HANNON asked the Secretary of State for India whether the cost of the collection of Indian land revenue, which amounted in the year 1919-20 to £25,794,743, was £4,297,484, or, approximately, one-sixth of the net income, while the cost of collecting the remainder of the revenue, amounting to £66,159,677, was only £4,291,098, or, approximately, one-sixteenth; and why the collection of land revenue is proportionately so much higher?

Mr. MONTAGU: The first figure quoted by my hon. Friend is the total net revenue under the account head, "1. Land Revenue, etc."; this includes land revenue

proper, forests, and tributes from native States. The second figure, the cost of collection, is the sum of a large number of items which are given in detail on pages 37 to 39 of the Finance and Revenue Accounts of the Government of India for 1919-1920. This figure includes a large proportion—which is generally 70 per cent.—of the salaries of the superior officers in charge of the general administration of India, and also the cost of many subordinate officials and establishments. These officers and officials carry out many duties unconnected with the collection or assessment of land revenue. The distribution of the cost has been made, as a matter of convenience for accounts purposes, on an arbitrary basis; and it certainly does not now represent the actual cost of the collection of land revenue. It would be impossible, for example, to allocate with any approach to accuracy the amount, debitable to land revenue, of the salary of the district officer, whose multifarious activities cover every branch of administration in India. I would add that the apportionment of the cost of establishments in India, as between “land revenue” and “law and justice,” was made many years ago, at a time when land revenue work was very much more important than it is to-day; and it is possible that, when the division was first made, it represented with a fair approach to accuracy the relative cost. Land revenue work is now a comparatively minor branch of the activities of the district officer and of his staff.

INDIAN STUDENTS' COMMITTEE.

Sir J. D. REES asked the Secretary of State for India whether a Committee has been appointed to examine the question of Indians in the United Kingdom; and, if so, what are the terms of the reference to such Committee and who are the members thereof?

Mr. MONTAGU: A Committee to examine the question of Indian students in the United Kingdom has been appointed. The Committee is constituted as follows:

The right hon. the Earl of Lytton, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for India (*Chairman*).

Sir Deva Prasad Sarbadhikari, C.I.E., Member of the Legislative Assembly and lately Vice-Chancellor of the University of Calcutta.

Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao, Member of the Legislative Council, Madras.

Mr. C. E. W. Jones, Indian Educational Service, Director of Public Instruction, North-west Frontier Province.

Sir Murray Hammick, K.C.S.I., C.I.E., Member of the Council of India.

Sahibzada Aftab Ahmed Khan, Member of the Council of India.

Mr. Ernest Barker, M.A., Principal of King's College, London.

Mr. A. P. M. Fleming, O.B.E., M.I.E.E., of the Metropolitan Vickers Electrical Company, Limited.

Mr. M. N. Chatterjee, General Secretary of the Y.M.C.A. Indian Students' Union and Hostel, London.*

Dr. S. K. Datta, Calcutta.

Miss L. M. Brooks, Warden and Secretary of the London (Royal Free Hospital) School of Medicine for Women.

Secretaries: Mr. E. G. Howarth, of the Universities Branch of the Board of Education; and Mr. R. E. Field, of the Indian Students' Department of the Office of the High Commissioner for India.

The terms of reference to the Committee are as follows:

To report and make recommendations in regard to

- (1) the adequacy of existing arrangements in India for facilitating the access of Indian students to the United Kingdom, including the constitution and working of the Advisory Committees and their future relations to the Provincial Governments;
- (2) the extent and directions in which the Secretary of State's control should be exercised as distinct from the actual work of administration which will be entrusted to the High Commissioner;
- (3) details of the work to be undertaken in the United Kingdom and the relations that should be established with Universities and

* Prevented from attending throughout the Committee.

other institutions or bodies, or with manufacturers or commercial firms in order to provide for the admission of Indian students and the provision of any special or technical training that may be required; and

- (4) any other question affecting the education or well-being of Indian students in this country upon which the Committee may desire to make recommendations.

COCHIN AND VIZAGAPATAM HARBOUR SCHEMES.

Sir J. D. REES asked the Secretary of State for India what progress has been made with the Cochin and Vizagapatam harbour schemes?

Mr. MONTAGU: No progress has, so far as I am aware, been made with the Cochin harbour scheme. In March last the Government of Madras stated that the arrangements for financing the work were still under consideration. On the Vizagapatam harbour scheme, only preliminary arrangements such as the acquisition of land are likely to be undertaken for the present owing to the difficulty of providing the necessary capital for construction operations this year.

ESHER COMMITTEE (MILITARY COUNCIL).

Sir J. D. REES asked the Secretary of State for India whether the recommendation of the Esher Committee, that a military council should be established to assist the Commander-in-Chief in his administrative functions has been carried out; and, if so, of whom does the council consist?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have no official information on the subject, but am enquiring.

SITUATION AND OUTLOOK.

Mr. LYLE asked the Secretary of State for India if he is aware of the disturbing rumours current with regard to the outlook in India during the next six months; and whether the Government is taking all precautions for the safety of isolated Europeans?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have no reason to suppose that the Government of India are under any special apprehensions regarding the outlook during the next six

months. The latest information at my disposal is that the situation in India is improving. The Indian Governments may be relied upon to take any action necessary for the preservation of order.

Wednesday, 22nd June, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

MOSLEM DELEGATION.

Mr. GWYNNE asked the Secretary of State for India what were the credentials of the Islamic Deputation to this country and by whom was Mr. Kidwai selected; what was the cost of the hospitality afforded to this Deputation by His Majesty's Government; what subsidies they received; and whether the amount paid was that demanded?

Mr. MONTAGU: The gentleman referred to came to this country under the auspices of the Government of India, and as representing the Moslems of India, to place before His Majesty's Government the views of their community on the Treaty of Sevres. When the Deputation was first received by me, Mr. Kidwai was introduced by His Highness the Aga Khan as one of its members. In accordance with the recommendation of the Government of India the expenses of the delegation will be met from Indian revenues. I cannot at present state the precise amount involved. The statements submitted by the members of the delegation have been referred to the Government of India for examination and settlement in India as far as possible.

DEOLALI CAMP.

Mr. GWYNNE asked the Secretary of State for India the result of the inquiry which he sent to the Government of India regarding the conditions at Deolali camp?

Mr. MONTAGU: The Government of India have reported that punkahs and fans are considered unnecessary at Deolali, which is a hill station; and that the camp has been inspected by officers from Army Headquarters and by the Colonel Commandant, Bombay, who

report that there is no reasonable ground for complaint either as regards messing or accommodation.

Monday, 27th June, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

TEA COOLIES, ASSAM (EXODUS).

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India if large numbers of coolies, engaged in tea gardens in Assam, were recently induced by agitators to desert to their homes on the grounds that British rule in India had ceased, and that they might no longer work for Europeans; what were the approximate numbers concerned; and whether he has information to the effect that many of these deserting coolies died *en route* to their homes from disease and privation?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am issuing to-day to the Press a full summary of two *communiqués* published by the Assam and Bengal Governments regarding these occurrences. A copy will be published in the OFFICIAL REPORT.

The following is the summary promised:

COMMUNIQUÉ.

Two *communiqués* have been issued, one by the Assam Government, the other by the Bengal Government, on the circumstances of the exodus of coolies recruited from other parts of India from a number of tea gardens in Chargola and Longai Valleys, Assam.

The Assam report says that the coolies struck first on 2nd May, and disaffection spread. Outwardly, the strike was for an increase of wages, but offers of from 30 to 50 per cent. increase did not stop the movement. By about the middle of the month between 6,000 and 7,000 coolies had left the gardens. The coolies gathered in the little town of Karimganj, and this caused great trouble to the municipal authorities, and no little suffering to the coolies themselves. Food was provided by the Government for those in need of it, and one issue of rice was accepted. Then the coolies were led to believe that acceptance of food from the Government would entail their being sent back to the gardens. Gradually the great majority of the coolies made their way to Chandpur in the Tippera district of Bengal, many forcing their way into the trains without tickets. It is unquestioned that great suffering and hardship were caused by these events, and the allegation has been repeatedly made that the exodus was

spontaneous, and was due to inadequate pay and brutal treatment received by the coolies. On the other hand employers are convinced that the coolies would not have left the gardens but for the efforts of unscrupulous persons who have been filling their minds with wild suggestions. The first batches to leave the gardens invoked the name of Maharaj Gandhi, and declared that they were obeying his orders.

The *communiqué* then proceeds to discuss these allegations and to review the general conditions of the tea industry in this part of Assam. These gardens, which produce a coarse quality of tea, have been particularly hard hit by low prices during the past year. The Government find that the coolies were not able to earn the wages they obtained in war-time, but that the accounts of very low wage rates are false. Although coolies were not able to supplement their wages as much as they formerly did, they must at least have earned the statutory wages. They also find that there is no evidence of ill-treatment, and point out that the gardens are regularly inspected by Government officers. They are prepared to investigate any specific case, and describe many of the stories to which currency has been given as deliberate lies. After investigation they are unable to accept the accounts of observers of the condition of the coolies *en route* to their homes as establishing the conclusion that they had been starved at the gardens.

As to the statement that efforts have been made by persons unconnected with the industry to promote discontent among the coolies, the Government know for a fact that such efforts have for some time been actively made, apparently with the intention of arousing ill-will against Europeans and the Government, although those concerned have for the most part been careful to keep outside the reach of the ordinary Criminal Law. The statements made by many coolies left no doubt that they were obeying an appeal made to them on other than economic grounds.

The Government consider that it would have been unwise, even if it had been legally possible, to compel the coolies to go back to the gardens, and they were not prepared to provide a passage home free to labourers who were voluntarily leaving their employment. They arranged that sick and destitute women and children and the aged and infirm should be fed and cared for. The Government and the tea industry have for some time past known that, in view of the rise in prices, some adjustment of wages is called for throughout the Province, and special inquiries, which are nearly complete, have already been made. But they repudiate altogether the allegation that the wages given in the case of the striking coolies were starvation wages, and are fully prepared to examine further the whole question of wages.

In view of the many serious misrepresentations which have been made of events at Chandpur where the coolies arrived on their way home from Assam, the Government of Bengal sent Sir Henry Wheeler, Member of the Executive Council, to make a thorough investigation. Sir Henry Wheeler returned

to Darjeeling on 3rd June, and made an exhaustive report. The arrival of destitute coolies began to attract the attention of the local officers about 9th May, and Mr. Wares, Collector of Tippera, arranged for a special steamer which conveyed home 1,000, plus children, from Chandpur to Goalundo, the cost being paid from charitable funds in official hands. On 16th May, 450 coolies, plus children, and on 17th May, 937, including children, were similarly dispatched by local officers on a Government guarantee for their fares. On 17th May information of events reached the Local Government, who informed the Commissioner of Chittagong (Mr. K. C. De), that the cost of repatriation was not a charge which they could properly accept, and since 17th May no coolies have been dispatched from Chandpur at Government expense. Meanwhile others in large numbers were continuing to arrive. Mr. De went to Chandpur on 19th May, when he found about 1,500 coolies in the railway station and yard, while 500 more were expected. It was decided to locate coolies on a football field near the station, and arrangements were made to erect shelters, summon medical assistance and make sanitary arrangements. The coolies would not leave the station for fear of being sent back. Large numbers poured in on 18th and 19th May, until there were about 3,000 collected all over the station yard and its surroundings. The railway yard and terminus are close to the steamer station. On the night of 19th May about 400 coolies rushed the Goalundo mail steamer and a much smaller number the Narayanganj mail boat. The rush had only been stopped by casting the boats off into the stream. The steamer flat was cleared by police, the crowd standing on the bank shouting "Gandhi Maharaj ki jai," being incited by townspeople. Some Europeans were hustled and hit. Excitement continued during the night, and an attempt was made to rush the Chittagong mail steamer.

On 20th May, medical opinion was that it was absolutely essential in the interest of public health that the coolies should not remain where they were. The premises had become grossly insanitary. There were five cholera cases among the railway staff, and nine cholera cases of coolies in the railway hospital. The Commissioner telegraphed for assistance, and 50 men of the Eastern Frontier Rifles, under Captain Sheppard, were moved from Dacca. Towards evening young men from the town began collecting at the station in considerable numbers, and there was shouting of "Gandhi ki jai." On the arrival of the military police, orders were given to clear the station. Officers and men shouted to the coolies to go, but they refused. Men stood up waving their arms with shouts of "Gandhi ki jai," and the police began pushing them. This being ineffective, they began to strike them, and the coolies moved off towards the football field. The witnesses agree that the coolies would not have moved unless force had been used, and that the force used was not in the circumstances excessive. In the morning the coolies had disappeared, and it is said that the local residents induced them to

move into the town during the night. On 21st May a general *hartal* was declared in the town, and is still continuing, in protest against the events of the night of 20th May, and the refusal of the local Government to pay for repatriation of the coolies. On 24th May a railway strike was declared at Chandpur, on the 25th at Chittagong. A strike of steamer service began on 27th May at Chandpur, and spread to Goalundo and surrounding centres. Sympathetic *hartals* were declared at Chittagong, Comilla Noakhali and elsewhere. A system of *chits*, countersigned by local leaders, had been introduced, without which shops would not supply; and Europeans and Government servants were being put to considerable difficulties. Most Europeans had lost their servants, and from all sides there were stories of intimidation of men willing to work. Cholera and disease made their appearance at an early stage, though accurate figures were unobtainable. Dr. Batra (of the Health Department on deputation at Chandpur) estimates deaths during the latter half of May at 160 at least.

Sir Henry Wheeler states that the points to which he directed particular attention were (a) the number of men injured in the affair of 20th May and the nature of their injuries, (b) the efficiency of the sanitary and medical arrangements, and (c) causes underlying *hartal* and strikes. The report shows that only two cases which might be described as serious have come to notice, and no injuries that might have been caused by a bayonet have been found. Details are then given of the full arrangements made by Dr. Batra for dealing with the sanitary and medical situation, and of the difficulties put in his way by the local leaders. One thousand of the coolies left in Chandpur were accommodated in some disused jute godowns, and were there cared for, but the residue of some 500 coolies remained in the town, local leaders expressing their inability to transfer them, despite Dr. Batra's protestations on the score of an epidemic in the town. They are undoubtedly a source of danger. The Commissioner and Collector testify to the energy and efficiency of Dr. Batra's arrangements. It is established that he encountered great difficulties from the non-co-operation party. The *hartal* of 21st May impeded the getting of all things, noticeably milk and vegetables, and he was allowed to buy nothing without the signature of local leaders. Matters came to a head on 28th May when Dr. Batra sent to Babu Hardgal Nag (a non-co-operator) for milk, and received the following note:—"On account of repeated complaints by our medical officers and volunteers we have made separate arrangements for the treatment of coolies; necessarily our volunteers are withdrawn from your flat hospital." Dr. Batra withdrew with his staff, and Sir Henry Wheeler indicated to the local leaders that Dr. Batra and his staff remain ready to give every assistance.

Sir Henry Wheeler goes further into the causes of *hartal* and strikes, as explained by the local leaders, and comes to the following conclusions:—

- (1) These coolies had to be moved from the railway premises. The force used

was not excessive. He is satisfied that the story that bayonets were used is without foundation.

- (2) For local relief officers of the Government did all that they could.
- (3) The calling of a *hartal* and two strikes has seriously prejudiced the welfare of the coolies, while the time of Government officers which should have been devoted to these coolies has necessarily been diverted to counter-measures, and all relief operations have been gravely hampered.
- (4) The *hartal* and strikes in their present form are instigated by political aims, and are merely a form of direct action. The welfare of the coolies has become a subsidiary issue with the local leaders.
- (5) By their action on two occasions the local leaders have definitely prevented the removal of some coolies who might have been conveyed elsewhere. The continuance of the steamer strike absolutely prevents any further movement of these coolies. The Rev. C. F. Andrews, who has funds at his disposal, is in a position to arrange for the repatriation of these men at once, and the responsibility of their retention is with the local leaders.

Tuesday, 28th June, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

REVENUE.

2. Colonel Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India the total gross revenue of India, including the receipts both of the Government of India and of all the different provinces; and what percentage does the proposed military expenditure of 62 crores of rupees bear to that gross revenue?

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Montagu): The Government of India has been asked to supply the figures, and I will let the hon. and gallant Member know when they have been received.

DISTURBANCES, BENGAL AND ASSAM.

5. Mr. A. SHAW asked the Secretary of State for India whether he can give the House any information regarding the recent disturbances in Bengal and Assam?

Mr. MONTAGU: I would refer my hon. Friend to the reply given yesterday to a question asked by the hon. and gallant Member for Melton.

Mr. A. SHAW: Is there any further information as to the situation since that communiqué was dispatched?

Mr. MONTAGU: I do not think so. My recollection is that I received the communiqué only a few days ago.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: Are any arrangements being made to facilitate the return of these coolies to their homes, or is it being left to chance?

Mr. MONTAGU: My recollection is that the Government have not felt it their duty to give free passages to the coolies. I will send a copy of the communiqué to my hon. and gallant Friend.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: Are we to understand that the Government of India are to leave these people to die of cholera and starvation on the roadside?

Mr. MONTAGU: Every conceivable step has been taken to safeguard the interests of these poor deluded coolies; but it would obviously be an unwise step to establish the precedent that when a coolie breaks his contract and leaves his work owing to gross misrepresentation of the state of affairs the liability should be put upon the Government of India.

Lieut. - Commander KENWORTHY: What about the Government itself?

Sir J. D. REES: Would it not be more useful to facilitate their return to their work rather than to their homes? Is any provision for that made by the Government?

Mr. MONTAGU: If my hon. Friend reads the communiqué of the Government of Bengal he will see that the Government have acted with great humanity, and have done everything possible in the circumstances. If, after reading the communiqué, my hon. Friend desires to put any other questions, I should be only too happy to answer them.

OFFICERS' PAY (RUPEE EXCHANGE).

9. Major McMICKING asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the fact that the sterling value of the rupee pay of certain classes of British service officers in India is less

than the home rates, the Government of India will permit officers to remit their rupee pay in sterling at the rate of 2s. to the rupee?

Mr. MONTAGU: For the reasons given in my reply to my hon. and gallant Friend on the 21st June, I am unable to accept the suggestion.

Major McMICKING: Can the right hon. Gentleman say whether the Government of India have considered the case of married officers who through family arrangements find it necessary to remit portion of their pay to this country?

Mr. MONTAGU: My hon. Friend will be aware that the fluctuations of the rate of exchange cause hardship to many other people besides those about whom he is asking.

Major McMICKING: Does it not really amount to a breach of contract with officers who in these circumstances are serving in India at a less rate of pay than they would receive at home?

Mr. MONTAGU: No, it does not amount to a breach of contract.

ELECTIONS (BOGUS CANDIDATES).

10. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the number of bogus candidates put forward at the last elections in India, the Government of India have now reviewed their previous decision not to require a deposit from each candidate for election to the Imperial and provincial legislative councils, as is the case with candidates in the United Kingdom and as also provided for in the new constitution of Malta; and, if so, whether steps will be taken in future to require such deposits and make them forfeitable if the candidates fail to secure a prescribed number of votes?

Mr. MONTAGU: I communicated, as I promised, the hon. Baronet's previous question on this matter to the Government of India, but I have not yet received from them any proposal for the alteration of the rules. I doubt whether in any case they would think an alteration necessary until they had considered what other amendments, if any, are required for the purposes of the next general election.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: Is it not the unfortunate fact that these bogus candi-

dates have not failed at the election, but have been elected?

Mr. MONTAGU: That depends upon what you mean by "bogus candidates."

EMIGRATION BILL.

11. **Mr. A. SHAW** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he can give any information regarding new Indian legislation with respect to emigration; whether the new Measure, if passed, will for the first time include Ceylon as a country to which emigration is restricted by special regulations; and whether the ports of Negapatam and Tuticorin, and other ports from which emigration ordinarily takes place to Ceylon, are not mentioned in the Bill among those from which emigration will be permitted?

Mr. MONTAGU: The Indian Emigration Bill, the objects of which are to continue the prohibition against indentured emigration from India and to provide for the control of emigration in the future, was introduced in the Legislative Assembly on the 21st March. I shall be happy to send to my hon. Friend a copy of the Bill and a copy of the explanatory speech made by the hon. Member in charge when introducing it, if he so desires. The Bill applies to emigration by sea to all countries, and both in the case of skilled and unskilled workers emigration shall be lawful only from the ports of Calcutta, Madras, Bombay, and Karachi, and such other ports as may be notified. Pending further examination, however, the Government of India propose to ask the Legislature provisionally to approve the present system of emigration to Ceylon and the Straits Settlements.

Mr. SHAW: Can my right hon. Friend say why the ports of Negapatam and Tuticorin, which are the ports ordinarily used by coolies going to Ceylon, are not mentioned in the Bill? Is this a case of arbitrary action by the Executive?

Sir J. D. REES: Is my right hon. Friend aware that hitherto emigration to Ceylon has not been regarded as emigration, and that India and Ceylon are so close together and the movement is of such long standing that the utmost inconvenience and hardship will probably result to coolies if previously existing arrangements are totally interfered with?

Mr. MONTAGU: It was because of that that the Government of India propose, as I have said, to ask the Legislature provisionally to approve the present system of emigration.

Sir J. D. REES: Will the right hon. Gentleman send me the papers in this case, because I think a provisional arrangement will hardly meet the case?

Mr. MONTAGU: Certainly.

Mr. SHAW: Will the question of these ports be taken up by the Government of India?

Mr. MONTAGU: Perhaps my hon. Friend will read the Bill. I think he will find that it is all right.

CIVIL SERVICE (DISTRICT OFFICERS).

12. **Mr. STEWART** asked the Secretary of State for India if he can hold out hopes of early action on the memorials submitted last year by a large majority of district officers, members of the Indian Civil Service; if he has information that numbers of these officers are in serious financial distress and unable to live on their present pay without falling into debt; and that economic conditions have rapidly deteriorated since those memorials were submitted?

Mr. MONTAGU: I would ask the hon. Member to refer to the reply given to the hon. Member for South Kensington on the 15th instant. The issue of the Resolution of the Government of India as to the pay of the Imperial Indian Services may be expected very shortly.

Mr. STEWART: Will the Indian Government do something to help Indian civil servants in regard to the question of transport from here to India, because with the present cost of passages it will be very difficult to enter the Civil Service if they cannot pay the enormous sums required?

Mr. MONTAGU: My hon. Friend will find that all the circumstances are met.

ISLAMIC DEPUTATION.

The following question in the name of **Mr. R. GWYNNE** was not asked when first called:

6. To ask the Secretary of State for India, if he will state what were the credentials of the Islamic deputation to

this country, and by whom was Mr. Kidwai selected; what was the cost of the hospitality afforded to this deputation by His Majesty's Government; what subsidies they received; and whether the amount paid was that demanded?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (Leader of the House): I am afraid my right hon. Friend (Mr. Montagu) is not here. He is attending a committee of the Imperial Conference, but was here earlier.

RICE.

The following question stood on the Paper in the name of **Mr. A. T. DAVIES:**

8. To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that business in the Indian rice market has been suspended by local merchants; whether the Home Government has received strong representations from rice merchants and traders regarding the situation; whether he is aware that all rice on the Indian market has been cornered by one or two operators, and that this artificial manipulation of prices tends to raise the price of this essential food; and does the Government propose to take any steps against such operators by legislation or otherwise?

Mr. GWYNNE: Is it not customary for Ministers to leave answers to questions with other officers of their Department in the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no obligation in that respect, if hon. Members fail to put their questions at the proper time.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

CAVALRY OFFICERS.

Sir S. HOARE asked the Secretary of State for India how many officers are actually serving at the present time with Indian cavalry, including officers on leave and seconded; how many of these it is proposed to dispense with when the reduction of Indian cavalry is completed; and what provision is being made for finding employment or compensation for officers whose services are no longer required?

Mr. MONTAGU: To obtain reliable figures of the number of officers now

serving with Indian cavalry it will be necessary for me to refer to India. The subject of the second and third portions of the hon. and gallant Member's question is at the present time under consideration by a Committee appointed by the Government of India, whose Report I hope to receive shortly.

BLIND WELFARE.

Mr. GRUNDY asked the Secretary of State for India the approximate number of blind people in India; whether there is any legislation in force for their treatment and care; and, if not, whether he will make recommendations on this subject to the Government of India?

Mr. MONTAGU: At the Census of 1911, there were 175,214 blind males and 173,133 blind females in British India. There is no special legislation applicable solely to blind persons, nor has the need of such legislation become apparent. Dispensaries, stationary and travelling, are available throughout British India where treatment is given gratuitously to all poor persons; and cataract and other eye operations form one of the largest and most widely appreciated branches of their work. In the United Provinces, for example, 12,326 in-patients were treated during 1919, and 591,229 out-patients for eye diseases.

RANGOON RICE MARKET.

Mr. ALFRED T. DAVIES asked the Secretary of State for India whether business in the Indian rice market has been suspended by local merchants; whether the Home Government has received strong representations from rice merchants and traders regarding the situation; whether he is aware that all rice on the Indian market has been cornered by one or two operators, and that this artificial manipulation of prices tends to raise the price of this essential food; and does the Government propose to take any steps against such operators by legislation or otherwise?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have seen a statement regarding the Rangoon market to the effect stated by my hon. Friend. As regards the rest of his question, I would refer him to the reply I gave yesterday to the hon. and gallant Member for Newcastle-under-Lyme (Colonel Wedgwood), of which I will send him a copy.

INDIAN DIVORCES (VALIDITY) BILL [*Lords*].

Considered in Committee.

[*Mr. JAMES HOPE* in the Chair.]

[*Clause 1.—(Validity of Decrees.)*]

Motion made, and Question proposed,
“That the Clause stand part of the Bill.”

Sir F. BANBURY: I should like to know exactly what this Clause does. There are only two Clauses in the Bill. Clause 1 reads:

“Any decree granted under the Act of the Indian Legislature known as the Indian Divorce Act, 1869, and confirmed or made absolute under the provisions of that Act, for the dissolution of a marriage the parties to which were at the time of the commencement of the proceedings domiciled in the United Kingdom, and any order made by the Court in relation to any such decree, shall, if the proceedings were commenced before the passing of this Act, be as valid, and be deemed always to have been as valid, in all respects, as though the parties to the marriage had been domiciled in India.”

I do not know what these words actually mean, but I think we ought not to pass this Clause without some further explanation.

The **SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA** (*Mr. Montagu*): This Clause is simply to make valid certain decrees granted in India for the dissolution of the marriage of persons domiciled in the United Kingdom. This provision legalises them, and will remove a great hardship in such cases.

Sir F. BANBURY: I really do not see why this Clause is necessary at all. If this has been going on all these years, why should it be necessary at this time to come forward with such legislation? I do hope that we shall have some further explanation as to the object of this Bill.

Question, “That the Clause stand part of the Bill,” put, and agreed to.

Clause 2 (*Short Title*) ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Bill reported, without Amendment; read the Third time, and passed.

Thursday, 30th June, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

ROYAL INDIAN MEDICAL SERVICE.

85. Brigadier-General COLVIN asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that many officers of the Royal Indian Medical Service have had no English leave for many years; and whether, having regard to the debilitating climate of India, he will take steps which will enable officers of this service to have leave at regular periods?

Mr. PARKER (Lord of the Treasury, for Mr. Montagu): My right hon. Friend regrets that, owing to the conditions created by the War, it has not been possible to grant leave to the Indian Medical Service to the extent desirable. Every effort is being made to bring the Service up to full strength, and so make it possible to grant leave more freely. As the hon. and gallant Member is doubtless aware, the terms of service have been immensely improved, with the object of attracting a larger number of candidates of the best type. But the falling off in the out-turn of the medical schools during the War makes this a slow process. In the meantime, all the Government of India can do is to restrict the amount of leave that may be taken by an officer at one time, so that as many officers as possible may come home.

Monday, 4th July, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

AGITATORS (PROSECUTIONS).

69. Colonel Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether the action taken against agitators in India consists merely in prohibiting them from addressing meetings or whether they have been prosecuted and sentenced under the law?

Mr. PARKER (Lord of the Treasury, for Mr. Montagu): No, Sir. Prosecutions have been undertaken with good results in several instances.

NEWSPAPERS (REGISTRATION).

70. Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether the editors and proprietors of newspapers published in India are now registered under the Law as well as the printers and publishers?

Mr. PARKER: The Law requires registration of declarations only in the case of the printers and publishers of newspapers.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

CIVIL OFFICERS' PENSIONS (WAR SERVICE).

Sir A. HOLBROOK asked the Secretary of State for India whether he will make a concession to officials now in the employment of the Government of India by allowing the time actually spent by them on military duty during any campaign, past or present, waged by His Majesty's troops, to count for pension, if not pay, on the same terms and conditions as made to officials who served during the period of the War, 1914-18?

Mr. MONTAGU: The concession referred to was granted as a very exceptional measure to civil officers of the Government of India employed in the great War. I have had no representations from the Government of India as to its extension generally to other campaigns. If my hon. and gallant Friend will furnish me with particulars of any individual case which he has in mind, I will have it examined.

EUROPEAN OFFICERS (PENSIONS).

Sir A. HOLBROOK asked the Secretary of State for India whether the war bonus granted to officials of the India Office has also been granted to those European employes of the Government of India who have left India on retirement, invalidation, or leave, and are now living in England, and who are experiencing the same or greater difficulty in meeting the increased cost of living as the officials employed in this country; and, if the war bonus has not been granted, the reason for this differential treatment?

Mr. MONTAGU: The officials of the India Office are on the same footing as

regards pay and superannuation allowance as officers of other Government Departments in this country, and consequently receive war bonus on the same conditions. The European officers of the Indian services are engaged on different terms. Various improvements have recently been sanctioned in the leave and pension rules applicable to these officers, but it has not been considered necessary to apply them to the English system of war bonuses. But in the case of officers in receipt of small pensions, relief has been given on lines generally similar to those of the British Pensions (Increase) Act.

Tuesday, 5th July, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

CIVIL SERVICES (PENSIONS).

1. Colonel Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the widespread desire expressed in the Indian Press amongst the members of the Civil Services of India to take advantage of the proposals of the Government of India, in their letter of 5th March, 1919, regarding proportional pensions for those to whom service under the reform scheme is not congenial, but who cannot apply for permission to retire till they know the conditions of retirement that will be open to them; and will he, therefore, now inform the Government of India of the pensions considered by him to be suitable to the various periods of service, as recommended in Clause 36 of the Report of the Joint Select Committee of 17th November, 1919?

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Montagu): I am addressing the Government of India, and an announcement will be made as soon as possible after I have received and considered their opinion on certain points.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY (FRANCHISE).

2. Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India what steps have been taken to carry into effect the assurance given by Lord Sinha, when Under-

Secretary of State for India, on the 26th July, 1920, that the franchise for the Indian Legislative Assembly should be conferred on retired Indian officers of the Indian Army?

Mr. MONTAGU: If the hon. Baronet will refer to the remarks of Lord Sinha in another place, as officially reported, he will see that what he said was that he was sure that this proposal would receive favourable consideration when the next revision of the franchise rules takes place. He also alluded to the recommendation of the Joint Select Committee on the Bill that "the franchise as settled by the rules should not be altered for the first ten years." In the circumstances, no steps have yet been taken to effect this alteration.

EXPORT CREDITS SCHEME.

3. Sir J. D. REES asked the Secretary of State for India whether the exclusion of India from the export credits scheme is intended to be permanent or temporary in character?

Mr. MONTAGU: I would refer my hon. Friend to the answer given by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Overseas Trade Department to the hon. Member for the Weston-super-Mare Division of Somerset on the 17th June, of which I will send him a copy. He will see that the announcement dealt only with present circumstances.

LEAVE PAY (SERGEANT-MAJOR J. F. CALLAGHAN).

9. Major Sir B. FALLE asked the Secretary of State for India when the case of acting Sergeant-Major J. F. Callaghan will be settled, his furlough extended, and the money due to him paid; and is he aware that this man, who is a married man with a family, has received a sum of £35 only as advanced pay since November, 1920?

Mr. MONTAGU: Sergeant - Major Callaghan's leave has been extended up to 11th June, 1921, and his discharge will be postdated accordingly. Owing to his having a heavy debit balance on leaving India, it seems improbable that any further amount will be payable to him, but I cannot give a final answer as the rate of leave pay admissible generally in this and similar cases is at the moment under discussion. I hope a final settlement

[Mr. Montagu.]

will be possible shortly. In the meantime, Sergeant-Major Callaghan has no doubt been receiving his pension from the Chelsea Commissioners.

RAILWAYS, COVENANTED STAFF.

10. **Mr. R. YOUNG** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he has received a copy of the petition sent by members of the covenanted staff to the directors or general managers of the Indian State Railways concerning the uneconomic position in which they find themselves owing to the continuing increase in the cost of living in that country; and whether he will consider the advisability of recommending that the overseas allowances granted to other Government servants will be extended to them in accordance with their petition?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am aware that a petition is being submitted by the covenanted subordinate staff of the Indian Railways to the superior authorities for certain concessions, including the grant of overseas allowance. It has not reached me officially from the Government of India.

KUMAUN FORESTS (DESTRUCTION).

11. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India if he can give any particulars of the alleged wholesale destruction of forests in Kumaun under the incitement of non-co-operators and revolutionary agitators as reported in the Press; and what steps have been taken to punish the offenders?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have no more detailed information than that contained in telegraphic summaries of a communiqué issued by the United Provinces Government, which appeared in the Press on the 3rd and 4th July. According to this telegram, 19 arrests have been made.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: Will the right hon. Gentleman say whether non-violent non-co-operation agrees with arson or not?

Mr. MONTAGU: It is wholly inconsistent with it, as I understand it.

ISLAMIC DEPUTATION.

6. **Mr. R. GWYNNE** asked the Secretary of State for India what were the credentials of the Islamic Deputation to this country, and by whom was Mr. Kidwai selected; what was the cost of

the hospitality afforded to this Deputation by His Majesty's Government; what subsidies they received; and whether the amount paid was that demanded?

The COMPTROLLER of the HOUSEHOLD (Major Barnston): I have been asked to reply. The gentlemen referred to came to this country under the auspices of the Government of India and, as representing the Moslems of India, to place before His Majesty's Government the views of their community on the Treaty of Sevres. Mr. Kidwai was not among the gentlemen invited by the Government of India to come as members of the Deputation; he was introduced by His Highness the Aga Khan, with the Deputation, when my right hon. Friend first received it. In accordance with the recommendation of the Government of India, the expenses of the Deputation will be met from Indian revenues. My right hon. Friend cannot at present state the precise amount involved. The statements submitted by the members of the Deputation have been referred to the Government of India for examination and settlement in India, as far as possible.

INCITEMENTS TO VIOLENCE.

7. **Mr. GWYNNE** asked the Secretary of State for India what were the exact terms of the recantation of Mahomet Ali and Shankat Ali in response to the threat of the Viceroy to arrest them; was a definite promise to desist from making revolutionary speeches given; if so, for how long; and have either of them made any speeches since?

Major BARNSTON: My right hon. Friend will circulate in the OFFICIAL REPORT the text of the communiqué issued by the Government of India, which contains the exact terms of the apology and undertaking given by Messrs. Mahomet Ali and Shankat Ali, and which was communicated to the Press here on the 31st May. He believes that one of the brothers has spoken in public since.

The following is the communiqué issued by the Government of India:

"The attention of the public has doubtless been drawn to the apology and undertaking issued to-day by Messrs. Mahomed Ali and Shankat Ali to the Press. This document runs as follows:

'Friends have drawn our attention to certain speeches of ours which, in their

opinion, have a tendency to incite to violence. We desire to state that we never intended to incite to violence, and we never imagined that any passages in our speeches were capable of bearing the interpretation put upon them, but we recognise the force of our friends' argument and interpretation. We sincerely feel sorry and express our regret for the unnecessary heat of some of the passages in these speeches, and we give our public assurance and promise to all who may require it, that so long as we are associated with the movement of non-co-operation, we shall not directly or indirectly advocate violence at present or in the future, nor create an atmosphere of preparedness for violence. Indeed, we hold it contrary to the spirit of non-violent non-co-operation to which we have pledged our word.'

In view of the publication of these expressions of regret and promise for the future, the Government of India desire to make it known generally that they had decided on the 6th of May to prosecute Messrs. Mahomed Ali and Shaikat Ali for certain speeches delivered in the United Provinces during the last few months. These speeches, in the opinion of the Government of India, were direct incitements to violence. The immediate object of the Government in determining to enforce the law on the present occasion was to prevent incitements to violence and to preserve order. After the decision to which reference was made was reached, it was urged upon the Government, that their immediate object could be attained without recourse to the Criminal Courts. The Government consequently suspended further action, and in view of the statements now issued over the signature of Messrs. Mahomed Ali and Shaikat Ali have decided to refrain from instituting criminal proceedings against them in respect of these speeches, so long as the solemn public undertaking contained in the statement issued to the Press is observed. Should the conditions of this undertaking not be performed, the Government of India will be at liberty to prosecute for these past speeches. It must not be inferred from the original determination for the Government to prosecute for speeches inciting to violence that promoting disaffection of a less violent character is not an offence against the law. The Government of India desire to make it plain, that they will enforce the law relating to offences against the State as and when they may think fit against any persons who have committed breaches of it."

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

80TH CARNATIC INFANTRY REGIMENT.

Mr. LINDSAY asked the Secretary of State for India whether the 80th Carnatic

Infantry is now being disbanded; if so, considering that this regiment, which was raised in 1777, is the only infantry regiment of the Indian Army that has the honour of carrying a third colour, to mark its capture in action, for what reason has it been selected for disbandment; whether the orders for the disbandment of the regiment by 10th September can be modified; and, if not, what arrangements are being made about the officers and men now serving in the regiment?

Mr. MONTAGU: The 80th Carnatic Infantry is one of the units earmarked for disbandment, and I understand that the regiment will probably be disbanded by 10th September. One cannot but view with regret the passing of a regiment whose historical associations extend so far back and whose colours bear the battle honours "Sholinghur," "Carnatic," "Mysore," and "Seringapatam," but as I stated in this House on 31st May, when replying to the hon. and gallant Member for the Melton Mowbray division, the decision as to which particular units should be disbanded on becoming surplus to requirements is a question which must be left to the Government of India, who, without doubt, appreciate to the full the services of the regiment. The disposal of the officers and men of this and any other units that may be affected is receiving the careful consideration of the Government of India. I am not at present in a position to inform my hon. Friend what arrangements will finally be made for the officers, but the Indian ranks who are surplus to requirements will receive mustering-out concessions according to the terms of their enlistment.

RAILWAY GOODS RATES.

Sir T. BENNETT asked the Secretary of State for India whether, considering the objections to the imposition of a surcharge on goods rates on Indian railways, and the necessity of substituting for it a revised scale of rates which would provide the State and the railways alike with a much needed addition to their resources, and, seeing that a revised scale of charges has now been completed and approved of, but is not to be brought into operation until April, 1922, instead of in September next as was originally contemplated, notwithstanding the assurance given in March last that the surcharge was only temporary and would cease when the new

rates were ready to be brought into operation, will he accelerate the coming into force of the new rates?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am alive to the objections and am in correspondence with the Government of India on the subject.

SITUATION.

Mr. LYLE asked the Secretary of State for India whether speakers with pro-Indian sympathies and personal knowledge are delivering addresses all over this country asserting that the situation in India has very much changed for the worse within the past year; whether this is so; and, if so, what is the explanation in view of the introduction of the reforms?

Mr. MONTAGU: I do not know what speeches my hon. Friend is referring to. I hope we are all pro-Indians. It is common knowledge that the situation in India has given cause for anxiety during the past year and that this has been mainly due to the activities of persons who had expressed their intention of not taking advantage of the Act of 1919. But I hope the situation is improving. The world is restless, India not more so than many other countries, perhaps, because of the reform scheme which is working successfully.

Wednesday, 6th July, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

NON-CO-OPERATION MOVEMENT.

92. Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India if he is aware that, under the non-co-operation movement in India the cooks and servants of Europeans and loyal Indians have been boycotted and forced to strike, with a view of rendering the position of their employers intolerable and driving them out of the country; and, if so, what has been done in the matter?

Mr. PARKER (for Mr. Montagu): I have been asked to reply. My right hon.

Friend has received reports that action of the kind has been attempted by non-co-operators in some areas. He has not heard that the authorities in India have found it necessary to take any special action.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS (SECRETARIAT).

95. Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS asked the Secretary of State for India what was the number and salaries of the secretaries and deputy-secretaries for the provincial Governments of India prior to his last visit to India; and what is the number and salaries to-day?

Mr. PARKER: My right hon. Friend has not the information for which the hon. Baronet asks.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS, DELHI.

Major GLYN asked the Secretary of State for India what is the total sum that has been voted for Imperial Delhi; how much has been expended and how much has the expenditure exceeded the Estimates; how many of the Government offices have been constructed, and what is the date when it is contemplated that the Government of India can be established in the new city; when will the new Vice-regal lodge be completed; and is more money to be expended on unnecessary structures such as the new triumphal arch?

Mr. MONTAGU: The sanctioned Estimate stands at present at 9 crores 28 lakhs, but I understand that a revised Estimate is under preparation which is expected to amount to 12 crores 92 lakhs. The actual expenditure up to 31st March, 1921, was 4 crores 33 lakhs. None of the Government offices has, so far as I am aware, been completed yet. The earliest date at which it is expected that the work on the new city, including the Vice-regal residence and the Secretariat buildings, will be completed, is 1926. Until I have received the revised Estimates from the Government of India I cannot say what additional works will be proposed.

Monday, 11th July, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

FRANCHISE (ARMY OFFICERS).

91. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of Lord Sinha's assurance of the 26th July, 1920, that the franchise for the Indian Legislative Assembly would be conferred on retired Indian officers of the Indian Army, the necessary steps will be taken to confer the franchise on these officers before the date of the next election?

Lieut.-Colonel BUCKLEY (for Mr. Montagu): A question to the same effect was answered last week.

OFFICERS' PENSIONS.

92. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India whether a decision has now been arrived at on the subject of the additional pension of £100 and £200 a year which it was stated in the India Office Memorandum of the 3rd June, 1920, would be granted to officers of the Indian Army on the supernumerary list who had held high civil appointments?

Lieut.-Colonel BUCKLEY: The matter has been practically settled, and it is hoped to announce the decision in the course of the next week.

Tuesday, 12th July, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

INDIAN COLONISATION, FIJI.

1. **Sir J. D. REES** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he can give the House any information regarding the Committee the Government of India proposes to despatch to Fiji?

The **SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA** (Mr. Montagu): The Government of India and the Government of Fiji have agreed that a Committee, composed of Mr. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, Member of the Indian Council of State;

Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru, Member of the Legislative Council, United Provinces; and Mr. G. L. Corbett, C.I.E., Indian Civil Service, should visit Fiji in the autumn of this year.

The terms of reference to the Committee will be:—

(1) To inquire into the conditions of Indians now resident in Fiji, and to ascertain causes of discontent.

(2) To advise whether or not, having regard to all the circumstances of the case, Fiji offers a suitable field for Indian colonisation. It will report to the Government of India, and its report will furnish material for a decision by the Indian Legislature whether Indian colonisation in Fiji should be permitted under the new Emigration Bill.

A detailed communiqué, of which I have sent the hon. Member a copy, was issued to the Press on 26th June.

PRESS LEGISLATION.

2. **Colonel Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the fact that at present only the printers and publishers of newspapers in India are required by law to be registered, steps will now be taken to require the proprietors and editors of newspapers in India to be similarly registered?

Mr. MONTAGU: The whole question of Press legislation in India is now under consideration by the Government of India, in consultation with a Committee specially appointed for the purpose. I understand that the point which my hon. and gallant Friend has in mind is not being overlooked.

Sir C. YATE: Will the right hon. Gentleman impress the necessity of this upon the Government of India?

Mr. MONTAGU: I do not think there is any necessity to impress it upon the Government of India. I have ascertained that it is not being overlooked, but it is being considered.

COTTON GOODS (IMPORT DUTIES).

3. **Mr. WADDINGTON** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware of the dividends paid by Indian cotton mills as exemplified by Sholapore

[Mr. Waddington.]

Company, 1,000 per cent. per annum, Lakshmi Company and Maneckji Company each 500 per cent., Kohinoor Company, 375 per cent., Morarjee Goculdas Company and Swadeshi Company, each 350 per cent., Madras United, 300 per cent., and many others from 100 per cent. to 300 per cent.; whether, as these dividends were declared shortly before the Indian Budget was introduced, the Indian Government considered these large profits when framing schemes to raise revenue and, if so, what additional taxes have been imposed upon and what additional revenue is expected from cotton mills companies; and, if such revenue is not in fair proportion to the increases in import duties, will he represent to the Indian Government the need of reconsidering the import duties on cotton goods in view of such large sources of internal revenue being available?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am aware that the Indian cotton mills have recently paid large dividends, but the figures given by my hon. Friend appear to be greatly in excess of those published in the Press. The only additional tax specifically imposed on the cotton mills companies in connection with the recent Indian Budget lay in the withdrawal of the concession under which machinery and stores imported for use in a cotton spinning or weaving mill were admitted free of duty. The additional revenue anticipated from the change is 10 lakhs. With regard to the last part of the question, I can only refer my hon. Friend to the reply I gave on 23rd March to a deputation from Lancashire regarding the Indian cotton duties.

Captain GEE: Can the right hon. Gentleman say whether the figures given by the hon. Member, though they may be in excess of the figures published in the British Press, are correct from the official accounts of the companies concerned?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am informed that they are greatly in excess of any figures that we have.

Mr. WADDINGTON: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that he can get confirmation of these figures from the "Times of India" in any issue for the last two months, and that these figures are published and are available for the information of anybody connected with the Indian

Office; and, if these figures are justified, and considering that the question of the Indian Import Duties was purely one of revenue and not of protection for India, is it not desirable that these duties should be reconsidered and that the burden should be placed on the available revenues in India?

Mr. MONTAGU: I will investigate the figures further, but I do not think they affect the principle laid down, after discussion by a Committee of this House, that the Government of India should have fiscal autonomy.

Mr. W. THORNE: Is it not possible for the firms to pay these dividends in consequence of the low wages paid to textile workers and the long hours worked?

Mr. SPEAKER: Any further questions must be put on the Paper.

ARMY REDUCTION.

4. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India if he will give a list of the pre-War infantry battalions of the Indian Army which have been earmarked for disbandment, with the date on which each battalion was raised; whether these disbanded battalions are to be replaced by fresh battalions; if so, how these fresh battalions are to be constituted; and for what reason the change is to be made?

Mr. MONTAGU: The only pre-War infantry battalion which has been reported as having been already disbanded is the 44th Merwara Infantry, which was raised as a local battalion in the year 1822. It is understood that the 80th Carnatic Infantry is to be disbanded in September. This unit was raised in 1777. Beyond these two battalions, I regret that I am unable to give my hon. and gallant Friend a list of pre-War infantry units earmarked for disbandment, as no final decision on the subject has been reached. The remainder of my hon. and gallant Friend's question therefore does not arise.

Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS: Can the right hon. Gentleman say whether his undertaking, given to me some months ago, that no further reductions would take place pending the decision of the Committee of Imperial Defence, is valid?

Mr. MONTAGU: Yes. The undertaking which I gave to my hon. Friend will be strictly observed.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir S. HOARE: What is happening to the officers of these disbanded battalions which are being retrenched?

Mr. MONTAGU: I understand that a committee is working out the details of disbandment. I think I answered a question of the hon. Baronet the day before yesterday.

Sir S. HOARE: Will the right hon. Gentleman be able to give me a more explicit answer upon that point soon, in view of the great anxiety amongst these officers in India upon that question.

Mr. MONTAGU: Yes. I want to give my hon. Friend and the House an explicit answer, and I hope to be able to give it soon.

Sir C. YATE: Will the right hon. Gentleman answer my question as to whether these disbanded battalions are to be replaced by fresh battalions, and how they are to be constituted?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am sorry that I overlooked that part of my hon. Friend's question. Perhaps he will be good enough to repeat it. I have not the information, but I believe the disbandment is due to reduction, and therefore I do not imagine that the battalions will be replaced.

Sir C. YATE: Was not a promise given that no pre-War battalions would be reduced?

Mr. MONTAGU: No. Perhaps my hon. and gallant Friend will refresh his memory.

SPEECHES (REV. W. SANDERSON).

5. **Sir J. D. REES** asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to alarmist statements regarding India made by the Rev. W. Sanderson, who is understood to be an agent of the European Association; whether this gentleman is responsible for the circulation of an invention to the effect that a Sikh regiment had mutinied and had been disbanded after the execution of 18 sepoys, in which from whomsoever proceeding there was not a word of

truth; and, if so, whether, in view of the very serious results of such misstatements, any steps can and will be taken to restrain the reverend gentleman from giving rein to his imagination upon public platforms?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have seen reports of a number of utterances by this gentleman, to some of which I have found it necessary to take exception, but I have no information connecting him with the circulation of the false report referred to which was telegraphed from Calcutta to certain London newspapers.

PUBLIC SERVICES.

6. **Sir CHARLES OMAN** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he has received a memorial sent by telegram to him by the Indian Civil Service Central Association, representing a large majority of the officers of the Indian Civil Service now serving in British India; whether the said memorial sets forth their profound dissatisfaction with the increasing difficulties of the public service since the passing of the Government of India Act; and what reply he has given to the memorialists, in view of the personal responsibility to them under his pledges given at the time of the passing of that Act?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have received the telegram referred to and will send a copy to the hon. Member. I think this will be a better plan than commenting on his description of it in the second part of the question. The Government of India are about to issue a comprehensive resolution dealing with the whole question of the pay of the all India services. The substance of my reply to the memorialists will be indicated in the Resolution, which I would ask the hon. Member to await.

Sir C. OMAN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that I have got a copy, and does he consider that the increasing difficulties of the public service set forth by the gentleman in question in this telegram do or do not exist?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am anxious to avoid disputation as to the meaning of the telegram. The memorialists refer to a passage in the Montagu-Chelmsford Report. I have nothing to withdraw from that.

Sir W. PEARCE: Are the salaries and allowances sufficient to meet the increases in the cost of living, and is it not rather

[Sir W. Pearce.]
the financial question that causes dissatisfaction, than the new situation in regard to the Government of India?

Mr. MONTAGU: I think there is a good deal of economic dissatisfaction.

Sir C. YATE: Can the right hon. Gentleman say on what date he will be able to give us the Government of India Resolution?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am afraid I cannot. It is a matter of practice and precedent that any communication must be made through the Government of India.

7. **Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he has had any report from India as to the growth of bureaucracy since the institution of the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms; and whether he can give any estimate as to the additional cost of governing the country incurred in consequence of such increase in officials?

Mr. MONTAGU: I do not follow the first part of my hon. Friend's question. I do not understand how the scheme of Government instituted by the Government of India Act to which this House assented in 1919 could have led to a growth of bureaucracy. As to the cost of that scheme, I will certainly endeavour to furnish the House with a statement.

Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS: Does not the question say "since," and not "in consequence of"?

Mr. MONTAGU: I find it difficult to understand how it is possible that a measure for the institution of a democratic form of government in India can possibly have led to a growth of bureaucracy.

8. **Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he can give any assurance that if an officer submits an application for permission to retire on proportionate pension on the ground of his dissatisfaction with the new conditions, and his application is refused, the application will, in no circumstances be treated as implying willingness to retire without a pension, and that steps will be taken to ensure that the fact that he has submitted such an application will not be disclosed?

Mr. MONTAGU: Yes, Sir; I can give an unqualified assurance on both points.

Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS: Will the right hon. Gentleman soon be able to answer the question as to the terms on which men may retire, if they wish to do so?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have decided the matter. A despatch has been sent to the Government of India. I hope it will be only a short time before the receipt is acknowledged, and it can be published.

Sir C. YATE: Will the right hon. Gentleman be able to publish it in this country?

Mr. MONTAGU: I will take steps to see that any Resolution published by the Government of India is published at the same time in this country.

NON-CO-OPERATION MOVEMENT.

9. **Captain Viscount CURZON** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he can make any statement as to the activities of Gandhi and the Ali brothers; and whether any disturbances have arisen owing to the direct or indirect activities of these individuals since they were received by the Viceroy?

Mr. MONTAGU: I do not think there is any detailed statement that I could make in reply to the first part of the question. The Government of India have not indicated to me, that in their opinion the undertaking to refrain from encouragement to violence has been disregarded since it was given. As regards the last part of the question, disturbances have occurred since the Viceroy accorded an interview to Mr. Gandhi. The reports of these have been communicated to the Press immediately on receipt from India. There is nothing in the reports to show that the outbreaks were directly attributable to the three persons mentioned.

Wednesday, 13th July, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA, NORTH-WEST FRONTIER OPERATIONS.

Sir D. MACLEAN (*by Private Notice*) asked the President of the Board of Trade if he had any information he could give

the House, in the unavoidable absence of the Secretary of State for India with regard to the regrettable losses of British Forces on the North-West Frontier?

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of TRADE (Mr. Stanley Baldwin): My right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for India regrets he is unable to be present as he has to be at an urgent meeting of a Committee of the Imperial Conference and asks me to give this answer: I have no information beyond that which has appeared in the Press about the incident which led to the casualties reported. I have telegraphed to the Government of India asking for any further information that they can give, and will let my right hon. Friend know as soon as I receive a reply. Generally speaking, the situation in Waziristan is that the Mahsud Wazirs have accepted our terms and were being employed on the making of roads. I think it is safe to surmise that incidents of this kind are due to the action of some recalcitrant sections of the tribe. As the road making proceeds, and if satisfactory arrangements are made with Afghanistan and in the East generally, we may hope that normal conditions on the frontier will be restored.

Friday, 15th July, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

MONASITE SAND (INDIA).

Mr. ARMITAGE asked the President of the Board of Trade whether the attention of the Government of India has been drawn to the importance of preventing the sources of supply of monasite sand again falling under foreign control?

Mr. MONTAGU: The arrangements made during the War for bringing the Indian supplies of monasite sand under British control are still in force, and no proposal to effect any change has, I believe, been before the Government of India. I have, therefore, had no occasion to address them in the way suggested by my hon. Friend.

Monday, 18th July, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

ARMY OFFICERS' PAY.

96. Colonel Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India what decision has been arrived at with the War Office regarding the adjustment of the pay of those officers of the Indian Army who were retained in the Army on account of the War beyond the date on which they became due to be placed on the retired list?

Mr. PARKER: I have been asked to reply on behalf of my right hon. Friend (Mr. Montagu). Before coming to a decision on this question, my right hon. Friend has found it necessary to consult the Government of India, whose views he has not yet received.

STRIKES, MADRAS.

97. Colonel WEDGWOOD asked the Secretary of State for India whether he has any news of the Madras strikes; whether the Government have facilitated in any way the formation of an Adi-Dravidian trades union or assisted the Adi-Dravidians to break away from their comrades; whether the strike leaders have been threatened with internment; and whether, in view of the serious position, he will recommend the immediate calling together of the Legislative Council of Madras?

Mr. PARKER: My right hon. Friend will circulate in the OFFICIAL REPORT an account of the Madras strikes to supplement from his latest information the details which have already appeared in the Press. As regards the second and third parts of the question, my right hon. Friend has no information, but is making inquiries. As regards the last part, my right hon. Friend understands that Lord Willingdon is himself dealing with the case, and he thinks that my hon. and gallant Friend will share his confidence that His Excellency will take this or whatever action is likely to prove helpful.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: My right hon. Friend is quite mistaken. May I ask why the Secretary of State for India is not here?

Mr. PARKER: He is away on an important engagement.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: Why is he never here?

The following is the information promised:

On the 29th June the huts of non-caste mill-workers in Madras were set fire to by caste strikers, and the police and members of the fire brigade were assaulted by the strikers. On the 30th June further incendiarism occurred in the same neighbourhood, and both the police and the fire brigade were more seriously attacked. The mob was dispersed by bayonet charges; no loss of life was reported to me. The total number of huts burnt was 92.

On the 2nd July the Anglo-Indian foreman of the Buckingham Mills was attacked by 40 Mohammedans and Hindus near the mill, was knocked off his bicycle and badly beaten. He was severely wounded in the body, sustained a knife cut in the head, and was left unconscious. Subsequently he made his way to the police station. He has not found it possible to identify his assailants. Two shots were fired by an unseen person at a police patrol which was sent out when the occurrence was reported.

On the 3rd July the Mohammedan driver of the manager of the mills was assaulted by Mohammedans and was chased from the manager's compound to his verandah, where three toes were cut off and his fingers were injured by a knife wound. A police officer discovered him walking in a dazed condition. He is now being detained in hospital.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

REVERSE DRAFTS.

Lieut.-Colonel HURST asked the Secretary of State for India whether the loss caused to the Indian Treasury on reverse council bills in 1919-20 has been estimated by the Financial Minister in India at £17,500,000; why reverse bills were not sold by competitive tender but allotted to favoured groups of financiers;

whether the effect of this policy has been to enrich the financiers in question by £29,000,000 and to contribute materially to the present fall of the exchange; and whether he will take active steps to fix the responsibility for these disasters?

Mr. MONTAGU: I presume my hon. and gallant Friend is referring to the statement in the Indian Finance Member's Budget speech that a loss of 17 crores resulted in 1920-21 from the realisation of sterling securities in the paper currency reserved to meet reverse councils.

The sale of reverse councils was not, however, the real cause of this loss, which would have been incurred whether they had been sold or not, in consequence of the decision based on the Currency Committee's Report that the sterling securities in the Paper Currency Reserve, originally valued on a 1s. 4d. basis, should be re-valued on a 2s. basis. The loss resulting from the sale of reverse councils at rates other than 2s. after the adoption of the Currency Committee's recommendations in February, 1920, is about 7½ crores. The policy of selling reverse drafts at fixed rates based on 2s. gold and not on the basis of competitive tender, was adopted in accordance with the recommendations in paragraph 62 of the Currency Committee's Report, though at a later stage it was considered expedient to base the sales on 2s. sterling, which was done with effect from 24th June to 28th September, 1920, when the sales were discontinued. I do not understand the allegation that reverse drafts were only allotted to favoured groups of financiers, or the figure cited in Clause 3 of the question. While I deplore the failure so far to make the Currency Committee's policy effective, I would remind my hon. Friend of the abnormal situation prevailing last year which resulted in an adverse balance of trade against India exceeding 75 crores. I am unable to accept the view that the sale of reverse drafts has contributed materially to the present fall in exchange; indeed, it would be only natural to infer that the sales which in 1920 aggregated £55,000,000 sterling, must have tended substantially to check the fall. I can assure my hon. Friend that the question of Indian Exchange is a matter of constant watchfulness by myself and the Government of India.

GOVERNMENT STAFFS.

INDIA OFFICE (PENSIONS).

Sir I. PHILIPPS asked the Secretary of State for India whether the officials and the clerical staff of the India Office have recently received an increase in their pensions; what is the average percentage of increase; and what is the maximum and minimum percentage of increase of such pensions?

Mr. MONTAGU: Under the Government of India Act the pensions of the permanent staff of the India Office are the same as those prescribed by the Superannuation Acts, and by Treasury Circular relating to bonus, for civil servants in other Government Departments in this country. The pension is based on salary plus 75 per cent. of the bonus applicable. No exceptional treatment has been or can be accorded to the India Office staff. The provisions of the Pensions (Increase) Act, 1920, have been applied to such of the pensions as satisfy the conditions of the Act, the maximum increase being 50 per cent., 40 per cent. or 30 per cent. according to the amount of pension, and subject in every case to the total income not exceeding £200 a year.

Tuesday, 19th July, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

ALIGARH DISTURBANCES.

1. Sir J. D. REES asked the Secretary of State for India whether he can make any statement regarding disturbances reported to have occurred at Aligarh?

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Montagu): I will circulate in the OFFICIAL REPORT the information I have received about these disturbances.

The following is the information:

I communicated to the Press on 6th July the first details of these occurrences which I received that day. I received on the 14th a further report, which, though issued to the Press that evening, came too late to secure general publication. It

appears that the main facts are as follow: On the 5th July a political agitator named Malkhan Singh was on trial at the Magistrate's Court, Aligarh. A crowd, composed of townspeople and villagers, had collected outside the Court, probably originally intending to make a demonstration. But, excited by agitators and by the rumour that another individual who was seen to enter the Court had been arrested, the crowd endeavoured to rush the Court. This was prevented by the police, who, after two warnings, used their batons. The crowd then moved off, intending to attack the bungalow of the reserve police inspector, which is some distance away. This was frustrated, and meanwhile judgment appears to have been pronounced convicting Malkhan Singh.

Later on a mob attacked and burned certain buildings in the City, including police quarters. One of the buildings attacked was the Treasury, the armed guard on which was compelled to fire. The magistrate visited the Non-Cooperators' headquarters in the evening, and warned them that any further disturbance would be severely repressed—a warning which had the desired effect. Disturbances had entirely ceased before reinforcements of British and Indian troops arrived from Agra.

It seems quite clear that the attacks in the city were directed mainly against the police. No attacks were made on the houses of Europeans. Thirty arrests were made—chiefly rioters caught red handed in the police headquarters and persons with gunshot wounds. One constable was unfortunately killed and three dangerously wounded. It is not clear from my information whether any rioters were killed, but a number were wounded. The Moham-medan University was not affected, and, so far as is known, no students took part in the disturbances.

MADRAS LABOUR DISTURBANCES.

2. Sir J. D. REES asked the Secretary of State for India whether he will make any statement regarding labour disturbances in Madras?

Mr. MONTAGU: I would refer my hon. Friend to the reply given yesterday to the hon. and gallant Member for Newcastle-under-Lyme, of which I will send him a copy.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: Will the right hon. Gentleman consider favourably the summoning together of the Legislative Council of Madras, in order to deal with this question so that it may not rest entirely with Lord Willingdon?

Mr. MONTAGU: I do not think the hon. and gallant Gentleman would regard it as proper for me to consider this subject, because it is one which is entirely in the discretion of the Governor of the Province. I am quite convinced that if any useful purpose would be served by summoning that Council, Lord Willingdon would consider it himself.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: Am I to understand that these outcasts have been used as strike breakers to break up the men's unions in Madras?

Mr. SPEAKER: That question does not arise.

NATIONAL DEFENCE (COST).

3. **Colonel Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India what is the present approximate total annual cost of national defence in India, including naval, military, and air forces; what is the approximate annual cost per head of the population of the Indian Empire on this account; and how these amounts compare with the present approximate cost of national defence in Japan, amounting to £108,280,000, which works out, roughly, at £1 8s. per head of the population for the total Japanese Empire?

Mr. MONTAGU: The total cost of national defence in India for the year 1921-22 is estimated at 62 one-fifth crores of rupees. This gives a rate of expenditure of 2·43 rupees per head of the population of British India. A just comparison with the cost of national defence in Japan would involve other highly important factors, as, for instance, the ratio of defence expenditure to total expenditure, and the ratio of expenditure per head to average income per head of the population.

STAFF LINES BUNGALOW, ALLAHABAD.

5. **Colonel WEDGWOOD** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he will cause inquiry to be made into the case of the acquisition in the autumn of 1920 by the military authorities of a bungalow, No. 33a, in the staff lines, New

Cantonment, Allahabad, and as to why the appeal to him sent on 8th November, 1920, has not been dealt with?

Mr. MONTAGU: The acquisition of the bungalow in question took place in 1913, not 1920. The memorial to me of 1920 was withheld by the Government of India because over five years had elapsed since the passing of their final orders in 1915 against which appeal was made.

ARMY (REDUCTIONS).

6. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of his statement that reductions in military expenditure in India could only be achieved if compatible with the internal and external security of India, and his assurance that no further reductions would be made pending the inquiry by the Committee of Imperial Defence, and considering that in addition to the reduction of 18 cavalry regiments the 44th Infantry has now been disbanded, another, the 80th Infantry, is under orders for disbandment in September, and it is believed others are to follow suit, that in consequence the whole Indian Army is gravely perturbed, and having regard also to the fact that both internal riots and external frontier attacks are of increasing occurrence, he will now give orders for the strict observance of the undertaking which he has given, and put a stop at once to the disbandment of pre-War units of the Indian Army till the Report of the Committee has been considered?

Mr. MONTAGU: I would refer my hon. and gallant Friend to the answers I gave to the hon. Baronet the Member for Twickenham on the 23rd February and the 23rd March, and to my hon. and gallant Friend on the 6th, 19th and 26th April and the 7th June. As regards the units to be disbanded, I would refer to my replies to my hon. and gallant Friend on the 3rd, 10th and 31st May and the 12th July, and to the hon. Member for the Cromac Division of Belfast on the 5th July.

Sir C. YATE: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that every one of these replies was entirely unsatisfactory and can he give me a more satisfactory reply?

Mr. MONTAGU: I do not share my hon. and gallant Friend's view as to the unsatisfactory nature of the replies. My difficulty is to find a formula in which to answer the same question so often.

Sir C. YATE: Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the question of putting a stop to these disbandments which are so suicidal at the present time?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is the same question.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

BRITISH OFFICERS AND REGULAR TROOPS (PAY).

Lieut.-Colonel PINKHAM asked the Secretary of State for India on what date increased pay and allowances was sanctioned for British officers and Regular troops in India; and why the pay has not yet been issued?

Mr. MONTAGU: The dates on which the last general revisions of pay for British officers and Regular troops in India were announced and the dates from which they took effect are as follow:

For British officers, on the 3rd October, 1919, and 1st July, 1921, respectively.

For British non-commissioned officers and men, on the 31st August, 1920, and the 1st July, 1921, respectively.

Some further minor increases in pay of rank in some cases have been sanctioned for British officers of the Indian Army. I cannot at the moment say whether these have yet been announced in India. They will take effect from the 1st April, 1921. If my hon. and gallant Friend will furnish me with the particulars of any cases in which the pay has not yet been adjusted to the new rates I will gladly make inquiries.

Wednesday, 20th July, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

MADRAS PRESIDENCY (SETTLEMENT).

74. Sir J. D. REES asked the Secretary of State for India whether he has information to the effect that the Government of Madras proposes to extend the system of permanent settlement in that Presidency?

Mr. PARKER (for Mr. Montagu): I have not heard of any such proposal.

Thursday, 21st July, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

POLICE PAY.

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is now in a position to announce any new rates of pay that have been sanctioned for the Indian Imperial Police; and, if so, from what date the new rates will have effect?

Mr. MONTAGU: With the hon. and gallant Member's permission, I will circulate the particulars as to the new rates in the OFFICIAL REPORT. They will also be found in convenient form in the India Office List, 1921, as an Appendix to the Regulations for admission to the Indian Police. They will take effect from the 30th April, 1921.

The following are the particulars promised:

INDIAN POLICE FORCE.

Revised Scale.

Year of Service.	Junior.			Senior.		
	Per Mensem.			Per Mensem.		
	Pay.	Overseas * Pay.	Total.	Pay.	Overseas * Pay.	Total.
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
1st ...	325	125	450	—	—	—
2nd ...	350	125	475	—	—	—
3rd ...	375	125	500	—	—	—
4th ...	400	150	550	—	—	—
5th ...	425	150	575	—	—	—
6th ...	450	150	600	600†	150	750†
7th ...	475	150	625	625	150	775
8th ...	500	150	650	650	150	800
9th ...	525	200	725	675	200	875
10th ...	550	200	750	700	200	900
11th ...	575	200	775	725	200	925
12th ...	600	200	800	750	200	950
13th ...	625	200	825	775	200	975
14th ...	650	250	900	800	250	1,050
15th ...	675	250	925	825	250	1,075
16th ...	—	—	—	850	250	1,100
17th ...	—	—	—	900	250	1,150
18th ...	—	—	—	950	250	1,200
19th ...	—	—	—	1,000	250	1,250
20th ...	—	—	—	1,050	250	1,300
21st ...	—	—	—	1,100	250	1,350
22nd ...	—	—	—	1,150	250	1,400
23rd ...	—	—	—	1,200	250	1,450
24th ...	—	—	—	1,250	250	1,500
25th ...	—	—	—	1,300	250	1,550
26th ...	—	—	—	1,350	250	1,600
Selection Grade.	—	—	—	1,450	250	1,700

	Rs.
Deputy Inspectors-General	1,750-100-2,150
Inspectors-General, major provinces	2,500-125-3,000
minor "	2,250-125-2,750 (one)
	2,250-125-2,500 (two).

Where admissible.

† In 6th or any earlier year.

Friday, 22nd July, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA (BRITISH OFFICERS,
MARRIAGE ALLOWANCE).

Lieut.-Colonel BELL asked the Secretary of State for India when it is intended to issue marriage allowance to officers of the British Army serving in India in accordance with the promise given that

they should be put on the same footing as officers of British units serving at home in this respect?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am sending my hon. and gallant Friend a copy of an Indian Army Order issued on the authority of the Commander-in-Chief on the 3rd October, 1919, from which I think it will be seen that no definite promise was given that officers of the British Army in India should receive marriage allowance. Paragraph 17 of the Order shows that the question of introducing in India the differentiation between single and mar-

ried officers which now exists at home will be taken into consideration when the Indian scale of pay which came into force from 1st July, 1919, is reviewed with a view to introducing a more permanent scale. The question of what may be the most opportune time for introducing a permanent scale is engaging the attention of the Government of India.

Tuesday, 26th July, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

ARMY REDUCTIONS.

3. Colonel Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India what instructions he has issued to give effect to his assurance on the 23rd March that no further reductions would be made in the Indian Army pending the result of the inquiry by the Committee of Imperial Defence, and on what date these instructions were issued?

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Montagu): The answer is in the negative. The necessary instructions were issued, and as a consequence not only have my assurances been fulfilled, but at the present time the number of units in the Indian Army is in excess of the number which I assured the House would be maintained pending the result of the inquiry by the Committee of Imperial Defence.

Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS: Is the Committee of Imperial Defence sitting on this matter? If so, when does the right hon. Gentleman expect to have a Report from it?

Mr. MONTAGU: The Committee of Imperial Defence has been waiting for material, which is coming from a Committee sitting at Simla under the Presidency of Lord Rawlinson. I think that the Committee of Imperial Defence will meet very soon.

Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS: Is this question going to the whole Committee, or is it to be considered by a Sub-committee?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am sorry if I used a loose phrase. It is a Sub-committee.

Sir C. YATE: Will the result of the Report of the Committee in India be published in this country?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am not sure. I will consult the Viceroy on the point.

Sir C. YATE: I think there is a *précis* in the papers this morning, and if the right hon. Gentleman will publish the full report, it will be a very good thing.

MESS DRESS.

4. Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether, considering that the blue serge frock with trousers can now be worn as mess dress by officers of the British service up to December, 1922, he will consider the question of making this the permanent mess dress of the officers of the Indian Army?

Mr. MONTAGU: The permission referred to by my hon. and gallant Friend has been granted as a temporary measure to officers who do not possess ordinary pre-War mess dress. Reports of Committees recently held in England and in India on the question of uniform for future wear strongly advocate the continuance of pre-War pattern of mess dress.

MADRAS STRIKE.

5. Colonel WEDGWOOD asked the Secretary of State for India whether he can say anything as to the settlement of the Madras strike?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have received no further information beyond that communicated to the House last week regarding this strike, which is still in progress.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCILS (VETO).

6. Colonel WEDGWOOD asked the Secretary of State for India whether he will present a Return showing the questions on which lieutenant-governors of the eight major provinces of India have found it necessary to overrule, or veto, or modify decisions of their legislative councils during the present year?

Mr. MONTAGU: Perhaps my hon. and gallant Friend will confer with me as to the form of the Return for which he asks, so that I may take the necessary steps to present it.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

GOVERNMENT STAFFS.

INDIA OFFICE (HOLIDAYS).

Mr. T. THOMSON asked the Secretary of State for India what is the maximum annual holiday, exclusive of public holidays, to which the junior permanent staff are entitled; and whether any members between 20 and 30 years of age are entitled to six weeks' holiday in the year?

Mr. MONTAGU: The maximum annual holiday, exclusive of public holidays, to which the junior permanent staff of the establishment of the Secretary of State for India are entitled under the recent scheme of re-organisation, is 36 days. Some of them, however, who were appointed as junior clerks, first division, before the re-organisation, retain their title to the previous maximum of 48 days. Six weeks is now the sanctioned annual leave for entrants to the junior administrative and lower executive grades, and some of these are between 20 and 30 years of age.

INDIA.

EMIGRATION (CEYLON AND STRAITS SETTLEMENTS).

Mr. G. MURRAY asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware of the harm that will ensue to the colonies of Ceylon and Malaya by the passage of the legislation by the Government of India under which free emigration of emigrants from India to those colonies may be prohibited; and whether, in view of these circumstances and the fact that this immigration has always in the past been conducted on a perfectly free and satisfactory basis, he will communicate with the Government of India, inviting them to postpone this legislation pending a full inquiry into the whole matter?

Mr. MONTAGU: I would refer my hon. Friend to my reply to the hon. Member for Kilmarnock (Mr. A. Shaw) on the 28th June, in which I stated that, pending further examination of the question, the Government of India propose to ask the Legislature provisionally to approve the present system of emigra-

tion to Ceylon and the Straits Settlements.

POLICE PAY.

Sir J. D. REES asked the Secretary of State for India when the Government of India proposes to publish the new scale of pay for the Indian police?

Mr. MONTAGU: The new scale which I circulated with the OFFICIAL REPORT of the 21st July, in reply to a question by the hon. and gallant Member for Melton (Sir C. Yate) either has been, or is on the point of being published in India.

Tuesday, 2nd August, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

MONASITE SAND.

1. **Sir J. D. REES** asked the Secretary of State for India whether any foreign-owned company controls the sale of monasite sand in Travancore State or elsewhere in India?

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Montagu): The answer is in the negative.

CIVIL SERVICE (PENSIONS).

2. **Colonel Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the fact that the grant of an additional pension of £100 a year to Army officers having held high civil appointments in India is conditional on such officers having held posts carrying a pay of Rs. 3,000 per mensem and that this condition renders many officers, even up to the rank of commissioner, ineligible for the benefits of this concession, he will consider the question of reducing the minimum limit to posts carrying a pay of Rs. 2,500 per mensem?

Mr. MONTAGU: It was not the intention that this pension should be admissible to officers who have held civil posts of lower rank than that of commissioner. No commissionership of a division now carried less pay than Rs. 3,000 a month.

Sir C. YATE: Could the right hon. Gentleman not think of making it a minimum of less than Rs. 3,000 a month?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am not prepared to say that without consideration. I will consider it.

ARMY OFFICERS (DIFFERENTIATION).

3. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India whether, when the question of introducing in India the differentiation between single and married officers, which now exists at home, to officers of the British Army serving in India is taken into consideration, the question of applying the same differentiation to British officers of the Indian Army will also be taken into consideration?

Mr. MONTAGU: Yes, Sir.

CONTRIBUTION TO ROYAL NAVY.

4. **Commander BELLAIRS** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he has had under consideration the importance of the services rendered by the Navy to the defence of India and her trade; whether he can state what is the contribution of India to the Navy Estimates; and what has been the outcome of the deliberations in India and at the Imperial Cabinet in regard to an increase in this contribution?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am fully aware of the importance of the services rendered by the Navy to India, in common with the rest of the Empire. The direct contribution from Indian revenues to Naval Funds is £100,000 per annum. In the present financial situation in India and in view of the heavy burden which already falls on Indian revenues in respect of defence, I can hold out no hope of an increase to this contribution at present. I am unable to make any statement as to the proceedings of the Imperial Conference.

Commander BELLAIRS: Have the Board of Admiralty ever pressed for an increase, in view of the great services that the Navy renders to India?

Sir C. YATE: Has anything been done to give effect to Admiral Jellicoe's recommendations contemplating an Indian Navy?

Mr. MONTAGU: We have received Admiral Jellicoe's recommendations. Perhaps my hon. and gallant Friend will put down another question.

Commander BELLAIRS: May I press for an answer to my question? Have

the Board of Admiralty ever pressed the Secretary of State for India to make a contribution, in view of the great services rendered by the Navy?

Mr. MONTAGU: The services rendered by the Navy are not only to India, but to the whole Empire. With regard to the question of the hon. and gallant Gentleman as to the Board of Admiralty, I would suggest that question should be put to the First Lord of the Admiralty.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: Must not any question of contribution from India to the Imperial Navy wait till India has control of her own finances?

SUKKUR BARRAGE.

5. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Under-Secretary of State for India whether, considering the opposition to the Sukkur barrage project of 1920, he will appoint a Committee to examine and report on the scheme before it is proceeded with?

Mr. MONTAGU: My sanction to this scheme was accorded subject to reconsideration of the financial prospects. These are at present under discussion with the authorities in India. It is not my intention to appoint a further Committee of experts on the technical aspects of the Sukkur barrage scheme. The scheme has been exhaustively examined in India since the Committee of experts reported to my predecessor in 1913, and in its present form meets, I understand, all the objections raised by that Committee against the scheme then before them. I think there is no room for doubt as to the enormous benefits which this scheme would confer on Sind by the great new area which will come under cultivation and the population which it will benefit.

Sir C. YATE: Is not one of the conditions of this scheme that the revenue assessment of the Sind should be increased, or rather doubled, and will not this in itself cause trouble in the Sind?

Mr. MONTAGU: If the revenue assessment is increased, it is due to the fact that an area, roughly speaking, of about the size of Wales, which is more or less a desert, will be brought under cultivation.

Sir C. YATE: Is not the right hon. Gentleman aware that this area can be brought under cultivation without building the barrage as now proposed?

Mr. MONTAGU: That is exactly the question upon which the engineering advice at my disposal and the disposal of my predecessor differs.

POST OFFICE.

TELEGRAPH CABLES (INDIA).

29. Mr. STEWART asked the Postmaster-General whether he can give any information as to the progress of the repairs at present being undertaken to the telegraph cables to India; whether these repairs are being pressed forward as expeditiously as circumstances permit; whether messages paying the extra rate of 5s. per word are delivered promptly, whereas cable messages paying ordinary rates are sometimes delayed five or six days; and whether he can use his influence to ensure to the community that undue advantage is not being taken of the present position in order to force users of the cables to send their messages at express message rates?

Mr. KELLAWAY: The repairs to the Eastern Telegraph Company's cables to India have been completed, and the delay on messages paid at the ordinary rate has been reduced to about 1 day in the outward direction and 1½ days in the homeward direction. I am assured that all telegrams are dealt with by the company with the utmost despatch, and there is no ground for the suggestion that the delay is artificially increased in order to induce the public to send their messages at the urgent rate. The question of laying further cables is under consideration.

Mr. STEWART: Is it not a fact that before the War cables to India arrived in a few hours or at least in a day?

Mr. KELLAWAY: The War has made a great difference, but I am able to say that improvements are being rapidly effected.

Lieut.-Colonel NALL: To what extent are commercial cables to India delayed by Press cables and can the right hon. Gentleman offer any hope that the delay will be reduced?

Mr. KELLAWAY: I hope that all causes of delay between this country and India will be rapidly reduced.

Wednesday, 3rd August, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

COTTON (IMPORT DUTIES).

Mr. ALFRED DAVIES (Clitheroe) asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that Gandhi, the leader of the nationalist movement in India, has collected £1,000,000 sterling for the purpose of developing cotton manufacture in India and with the declared object of boycotting Lancashire cotton goods; whether he is aware that the cotton manufacturers of Lancashire are by no means averse to this form of competition, but that they realise a great danger to the Lancashire cotton industry if such competition is supported by the present import duties, which are already having a very serious effect upon the Lancashire cotton trade; and whether he will recommend that such duties be repealed or substantially reduced or, alternatively, insist on countervailing excise duties being imposed?

Mr. MONTAGU: I would refer my hon. Friend to the recommendation made by the Joint Select Committee of Parliament on Clause 33 of the Government of India Bill, 1919, of which I will forward him a copy.

BUCKINGHAM CARNATIC MILLS (DISPUTE).

Colonel WEDGWOOD asked the Secretary of State for India whether there has been a meeting between a committee of the Madras Corporation and the management of the Buckingham Carnatic Mills with reference to their lock-out of their men, and that negotiations proved unsatisfactory to the mill management; and whether the Madras Government will now bring pressure to bear upon the mill management to close the dispute?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have received no further information regarding this strike, but Lord Willingdon informs me that he is doing everything in his power to deal with the situation. I understand that the Madras Legislative Council met on Monday last.

SUKKAR BARRAGE.

Sir W. DAVISON asked the Secretary of State for India whether he has sanctioned an estimated expenditure of £18,500,000 on the construction of a barrage across the Indus; and whether, seeing that there are grave doubts in the minds of competent engineering authorities as to whether the necessary works can be carried out for the sum mentioned and that the making of the barrage may seriously affect the course of the Indus and do incalculable damage in the province of Sind, he will, under all the circumstances, withhold his approval of such a heavy expenditure with doubtful results under present financial conditions?

Mr. MONTAGU: I would refer my hon. Friend to the answer I gave yesterday to a similar question by the hon. and gallant Member for Melton (Sir C. Yate) of which I will send him a copy.

Thursday, 4th August, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

"INDEPENDENT" NEWSPAPER
(PROSECUTION)..

Mr. SPOOR asked the Secretary of State for India, whether Ranga Iyer, of Allahabad, the publisher of the "Independent," has been sent to prison for one year; and what was the nature of his offence?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am aware that proceedings were contemplated against this paper under that section of the Criminal Procedure Code which empowers security for good conduct to be taken from persons who disseminate seditious matter. But I have not heard the result.

COTTON (IMPORT DUTIES).

Sir W. de FRECE asked the Secretary of State for India whether protests against the recent increases in the Indian cotton duties are still being received from Lancashire; and whether there is any likelihood of a reduction to the recent percentage being approved in the near future?

Mr. MONTAGU: The answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. I cannot anticipate next year's Indian Budget.

GOVERNMENT STORES (PURCHASES).

Sir T. BENNETT asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Government of India, in a letter to the provincial governments, has proposed that the purchase of plant and machinery in India from branches of British firms shall be made only by the chief controller of stores, or by a highly qualified engineer directly responsible to the Government of India for the order so placed; and whether, in view of the devolution rules under the Government of India Act, which make stores required for the imperial departments a central subject, while other stores are classified amongst provincial subjects, such a regulation, if adopted, would compel an executive engineer in the Bombay presidency to purchase plant and machinery and component parts thereof through the Government of India?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have seen references in the Indian Press to consultation by the Government of India of local Governments on the proposals of the Stores Committee, but have no official information of their intentions. As regards the second part of the question, I have not yet arrived at any decision on this Report.

ADEN (ADMINISTRATION).

Sir T. BENNETT asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in considering the question of the transfer of Aden to the Colonial Office, His Majesty's Government have taken steps to ascertain the views of the Indian trading community in that settlement; whether the resolution of the Aden Chamber of Commerce, favouring transfer, expressed the views of more than a small number of the trading community, and has been repudiated by a much larger number of Indian and Arab merchants, including traders of influence and long standing in Bombay in the Indian, Aden, and East African trade, especially in an address to the Viceroy submitted by the British Indian Colonial Merchants' Association; whether the approval of the transfer to the Colonial Office, which was given by

the Aden Chamber of Commerce, was given in the belief that the transfer contemplated at that time was to the Egyptian Government; and whether before the change has been irrevocably decided on, His Majesty's Government will give due weight to the opinion of the communities who have done so much to build up the commercial prosperity of Aden?

Mr. MONTAGU: His Majesty's Government have not taken special steps to ascertain the views of particular communities; but they have received and considered representations, including those to which the hon. Member refers. It is the case that divergent views have been expressed, and that the resolution passed by the Aden Chamber of Commerce in January, 1920, referred to a belief that it was intended to transfer the administration of Aden to the Government of Egypt. His Majesty's Government will, of course, endeavour to give due weight to the opinions of all communities concerned. I would remind the hon. Member that Aden is not merely a town, in the development of which Indians have played a great part and to which they contribute about a fourth of the population; it is also a strategical point and an important political centre. I would add also that His Majesty's Government have accepted unreservedly the condition laid down by the Government of India that transfer, if effected, shall in no way impair the interests and status of Indians, who shall receive precisely the same treatment as that accorded to other subjects of His Majesty.

Friday, 5th August, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

LABOUR UNREST, BENGAL AND ASSAM.

Sir J. D. REES asked the Secretary of State for India whether he has any information to give the House regarding labour troubles in Bengal and Assam?

Mr. MONTAGU: The information I have received since I furnished the House at the end of June with a sum-

of the communiqués issued by the Bengal and Assam Governments indicate that the exodus from the Assam tea gardens has ceased, and that the connected steamer and railway strikes are for the most part at an end. Last month, however, some unrest was reported from the Duars and Darjiling, and the Government of India telegraphed that an organised campaign appeared to exist in the tea districts of Assam to interfere with the food supplies of the labour force in European gardens. Later telegrams indicate that the situation has improved, and that there is now little activity in Assam on the part of the non-co-operators.

Tuesday, 9th August, 1921.

EAST INDIA (COUNCILS).

1. "Address for Return" ordered showing, province by province, for the current calendar year the cases (if any) in which the governors of governors' provinces have found it necessary to disregard or modify decisions of their Legislative Councils under the provisions of the following Sections of the Government of India Act, and Rules under the Act, namely:

Sections 72 (c) (3), 72 D (2) (a) or (b), 72 D (6), 72 E, and 81;

Rule 22 (2) of the Legislative Council Rules;

with similar particulars for action by the Governor-General in relation to the Indian Legislature under corresponding provisions of the Act and Rules."—*[Colonel Wedgwood.]*

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

ANTI-BRITISH PROPAGANDA.

1. **Sir J. D. REES** asked the Secretary of State for India whether anti-British propaganda has been organised from the States of Travancore and Cochin, and developed in the British district of Malabar; and, if so, whether such action has been stopped by the Durbars concerned?

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Montagu): I have no information to this effect, but am making inquiries.

11. Captain Viscount CURZON asked the Secretary of State for India whether a Mr. Gandhi recently organised a bonfire of British-made clothing in Bombay; what was his object; whether a meeting was subsequently held; how many people were present; and who were the speakers?

Mr. MONTAGU: I gather that a bonfire was made of imported cloth in Bombay on 1st August. I have received as yet no official account of the occurrences.

Viscount CURZON: Can the right hon. Gentleman answer the latter part of the question: whether a meeting was held and who were the speakers?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have no account except what has appeared in the newspapers.

Viscount CURZON: May we take it that the accounts in the newspapers are substantially correct, and, if so, how are the Ali brothers carrying out the undertaking given to the Viceroy?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a separate question.

GERMAN INDEMNITY.

2. Sir J. D. REES asked the Secretary of State for India whether any decision has been reached as regards the share of German-indemnity due to India?

Mr. MONTAGU: It has been agreed at the Imperial Conference that India shall receive 1·2 per cent. of the total share to be received by the British Empire of the reparation payment to be made by Germany under the Treaty of Versailles. This at par represents £17,400,000 sterling.

WOMEN SUFFRAGE, BOMBAY AND MADRAS.

3. Colonel WEDGWOOD asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Legislative Councils of both Madras and Bombay have voted for women suffrage; whether this change in the franchise is being or will be embodied in the new registers; and whether, as soon as the new registers are prepared, the change will be followed by a dissolution of these two councils?

Mr. MONTAGU: If Press reports as regards Bombay (from which I have not yet received an official report) be correct, the answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. As regards the second part, the rules require the change to be embodied (not necessarily immediately) in new rolls, but ordinarily the rolls hold good for three years from the date of their first publication unless the local Government choose to prescribe a shorter period. The dissolution of a Legislative Council before the expiry of its normal period of existence is a matter for the Governor to decide upon, and I have no information that the Governors will think it necessary to dissolve the present Councils on this account.

REVERSE COUNCIL BILLS.

5. Lieut.-Colonel HURST asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that the loss in the sale of reverse council bills has so far amounted to 35 crores on transactions of 82½ crores (£55,000,000); why bills to this extent were sold without public competitive tender; whether he is aware that the council rate of pence per rupee exceeded the market rate by several pence and thus greatly enriched persons to whom the council bills were allotted; whether he is aware that Indian importers now refuse to meet bills drawn by Manchester merchants at current rates of exchange and purport to justify such refusal on these grounds; and if he will try to fix the responsibility for these financial errors?

Mr. MONTAGU: The 35 crores mentioned in the first part of the question represents approximately the difference between the rupee equivalent of the sterling drafts sold, taking exchange at 15 rupees to the pound, and the rupee receipts from the sales. For the reason given in my reply of the 18th July, the sum cannot be regarded as loss due to the sale of reverse drafts, and it must also be remembered that in the period prior to the sales remittances from India to England on Government account have been effected at rates of exchange considerably higher than 1s. 4d., these, in fact, ranging up to 2s. 4d. As regards the second and third parts of the question, the system of sale was based, as stated in my reply on the 18th July, on the recommendations of the Currency Committee. During the period of the sales differences between the market rate of exchange and

[Mr. Montagu.]
the rate at which the drafts were offered would have enabled allottees of the drafts to dispose of their exchange at a profit.

As regards part 4 of the question I am sending to the hon. and gallant Member a copy of the reply I gave to the hon. Member for Keighley on the 16th March.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: Can the right hon. Gentleman say whether the India Office has any statistics showing who made profits by reselling these bills, and to what extent profits were made?

Mr. MONTAGU: It is very difficult to ascertain.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: I suppose it is known to whom the reverse bills were sold in the first instance?

Mr. MONTAGU: I think so.

BRITISH OFFICERS (CHARGERS).

6. **Lieut.-Colonel JAMES** asked the Secretary of State for India whether the British officers serving with the Royal Artillery in India have to purchase two chargers; whether he is aware that in Great Britain an officer similarly serving is provided with a charger at the public expense; whether he is aware that, although officers serving in India are allowed to purchase their chargers from the Government at concession rates by instalments, even when these animals have been fully paid for, the purchasers are not allowed to resell their chargers except to the Government for five years; and whether, in view of the great hardship inflicted upon officers who have adopted the Army as a professional career, he will take steps to have this hardship and many others of a similar character, such as the compulsory purchase of oat-crushing machines at the officers' expense, removed at the earliest possible opportunity?

Mr. MONTAGU: The answer to the first three parts of the question is in the affirmative. Various concessions regarding purchase and upkeep of chargers have just been introduced by the Government of India, and I do not see my way, in present circumstances, to suggest that further privileges should be granted. I can see no hardship in requiring that a charger bought from Government for less than market value should not be sold, except to Government, for five years. I

have no information regarding the purchase of oat-crushing machinery. If my hon. and gallant Friend will give me particulars of what he has in mind I will make inquiries.

ARMY REDUCTIONS.

7. **Colonel Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India if he will state what was the number of squadrons of Indian cavalry allotted to the various provinces of India for the purpose of internal security under the new scheme for the reduction of the Indian Army; what was the number allotted for this purpose prior to the War; and whether any of the local Governments have expressed dissatisfaction with the amount of cavalry allotted to them for internal security under the new scheme and are opposed to the proposed reductions?

Mr. MONTAGU: No representations from local governments expressing dissatisfaction with the numbers of cavalry allotted to their provinces for internal security have reached me, nor am I aware that any have intimated that they are opposed to the reductions in that arm. I regret I am unable to give the disposition by provinces of cavalry allotted to internal security. This is a matter for the Government of India to decide, with the advice of the Commander-in-Chief.

Sir C. YATE: Can the right hon. Gentleman say what is the number allotted to the whole of India?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am afraid I cannot do that without notice. I cannot trust my memory for the figure. Perhaps my hon. and gallant Friend will put down a question.

8. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that his assurance of the 23rd March last, that no further reductions would be made in the Indian Army pending the final decision of the Sub-Committee of Imperial Defence, was taken in India to mean that no further reductions would be made from that date, whereas it is now being interpreted to mean that no further reductions would be made beyond those already sanctioned by him on that date; and will he state which of these interpretations is correct and, if the latter, what were the reductions he had already sanctioned prior to the 23rd March?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am not aware to whom in India the hon. and gallant Member is referring, but I can assure him that the Government of India have never taken my reply to his question of 23rd March to mean anything but that no further reductions would take place beyond those already sanctioned. If the hon. and gallant Member will refer to my reply on the 23rd February, he will see it clearly stated how many regiments of cavalry and battalions of infantry it was proposed to maintain.

9. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India how many British officers of each rank of the Indian Army it is estimated will have to be discharged as surplus to requirements owing to the proposed reductions; and what provision is to be made for these officers to enable them to start life afresh?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am in communication with the Government of India, but regret that I am not yet in a position to answer the question.

Sir C. YATE: Will the right hon. Gentleman be able to give a reply before the end of the Session?

Mr. MONTAGU: I very much hope so

ELECTIONS.

10. **Sir W. DAVISON** asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in the elections to the provincial councils in India, less than 1,500,000 persons went to the poll in districts having a population of about 240,000,000 and a qualified electorate of about 5,500,000, while in the elections for the Indian Legislative Assembly only 180,000 electors out of approximately 1,000,000 qualified voters actually voted; whether many of the voters who did vote were unable by illiteracy to differentiate between the candidates, many of whom were represented on the polling cards by pictures of goats, elephants, and donkeys; and whether he proposes to take steps to secure more adequate representation on the new council of Indian landowners and merchants in place of the existing preponderance of Indian lawyers?

Mr. MONTAGU: For accurate figures in regard to the elections, I would refer my hon. Friend to the Return presented to Parliament in April, of which I will send him a copy. As regards the second

part of the question, many of the voters were, of course, illiterate, and a system of symbols to assist voters to record their votes correctly was tried successfully in one province. As regards the last part, my information is that landowners (many of whom are also lawyers) as a whole have secured large representation, and that the same observations apply to commercial interests. I would refer my hon. Friend in this connection to the recommendation made by the Joint Select Committee on Clause 41 of the Government of India Bill, 1919, in regard to a future revision of the franchise. I will send him a marked copy of their Report.

Sir W. DAVISON: Does the right hon. Gentleman think that the figures of the recent elections in India clearly show that the broad-minded and impartial rule of the British Rajah has not been replaced by popular Government, but by the Government of an oligarchy which by no means represents the people of India?

Mr. MONTAGU: That is a debating point. Of course, if we could get a wholly satisfactory electorate in India, one of the main obstacles to complete self-government would be removed.

Sir C. YATE: Is it not a fact that there is about 45 per cent. of lawyers in all these Provincial Councils?

Mr. MONTAGU: I cannot endorse that statement offhand, but I would invite my hon. and gallant Friend to compare other Legislatures.

GOVERNMENT OF BURMA BILL.

Sir J. D. REES (*by Private Notice*) asked the Lord Privy Seal when it is proposed to proceed with the Government of Burma Bill?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: I do not think that at this late stage of the Session it is necessary to ask the House to proceed with this Bill. The Bill merely applies the Government of India Act of 1919 to Burma. This purpose can be effected under Section 52A (1) of the Act by notification. My right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for India, however, embodied the proposal in a Bill, in order to bring the matter within the purview of Parliament, in view of certain differences of opinion disclosed in the docu-

[Mr. Chamberlain.]

ments presented to Parliament as to the right constitution for Burma. In view, however, of the fact that for various reasons the Government of India, the Government of Burma, and a Joint Committee of both Houses of Parliament have now agreed that the right course is to bring Burma within the Government of India Act, the purpose of the introduction of the Bill has been achieved, and it would be, in my opinion, unnecessary in these altered circumstances to mortgage the time of Parliament by the passage of a Statute. Steps will be taken to proceed by notification.

Mr. G. TERRELL: Is my right hon. Friend aware that there is a very strong feeling of hostility to this proposal on the part of the Burmese people, and is it not only right that a grave matter of this sort should be submitted to the consideration of Parliament?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: My hon. Friend perhaps failed to catch the purport of the rather long answer I gave. There was no occasion whatever to proceed by way of Bill, but my right hon. Friend chose that procedure because certain differences had arisen upon the subject. The Government of India, the Government of Burma, and the Joint Committee of the two Houses of Parliament have all agreed that this is the proper course to take.

Sir J. D. REES: Is it not the case that the objection of the Burmese people is to not being put on an equal footing with the Indian Provinces in respect to constitution?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: I have no doubt that my hon. Friend is better informed than I am in this matter.

Sir C. YATE: Is my right hon. Friend not aware that the Government of India especially asked that this Bill should be presented to Parliament?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: The object of presenting it to Parliament was to have it examined by the Joint Committee of the two Houses. That Committee has approved it, and I do not think that it is necessary to keep this House sitting late hours to pass a Bill for which there is no necessity.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA (SUKKAR BARRAGE SCHEME).

Sir T. BENNETT asked the Secretary of State for India whether, before coming to an irrevocable decision in favour of the Sukkar barrage scheme, he will appoint an independent committee of experts to report upon the scheme in its technical and financial aspects, special attention being given to the serious allegations that have been made as to the unremunerative character of the project?

Mr. MONTAGU: I would refer my hon. Friend to the answer I gave on 2nd August to a similar question by the hon. and gallant Member for Melton (Sir C. Yate), of which I will send him a copy.

POST OFFICE (INDIAN MAIL).

Lieut. - Commander KENWORTHY asked the Postmaster-General whether he is aware of the grave inconvenience caused to business firms and individuals by the continued delays and irregularity in the delivery of the Indian mail; and whether he is taking any, and, if so, what steps to restore the pre-War conditions enabling the Indian mail to be delivered in this country in 14 days from the date of its despatch from Bombay?

Mr. KELLAWAY: I am aware of the inconvenience which is doubtless being occasioned by the irregular arrival of the Indian mail; and I can assure the hon. and gallant Member that all practicable steps are being taken to improve the service. In present conditions pre-War speed is not attainable, but it is hoped that before the end of the year the service will be accelerated and arrivals made regular.

Wednesday, 10th August, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

BRITISH SERVICE OFFICERS (PAY).

Sir F. HALL asked the Secretary of State for India whether British non-commissioned officers and men serving in

India receive their pay in rupees calculated at a fixed rate in sterling; if so, considering the hardship that is inflicted upon officers who are compelled to send a portion of their pay from India back to this country, he will take steps to see that officers are treated in a similar manner to non-commissioned officers and men with regard thereto?

Mr. MONTAGU: British Service non-commissioned officers and men in India at present receive the home rates of pay laid down in the Pay Warrant converted at 2s. the rupee plus a special allowance at present fixed at 50 per cent. The system of fixing the pay of British Service officers in India has in general been more favourable.

SMALL-POX, MADRAS.

Mr. WATERSON asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been drawn to the exceptionally heavy epidemic of small-pox which occurred in the Madras Presidency during the years 1917, 1918, and 1919, when the deaths were 34,958, 58,752, and 41,732, respectively, the number in 1918 representing nearly two-thirds of the total number of deaths from small-pox in British India; and whether any special investigation has been made of the causes of the epidemic and of the failure of vaccination to prevent it particularly in view of the fact that vaccination is compulsory in all the municipalities, and in 193 villages and 70 ranges of the Presidency?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have seen reports containing these figures. The heavy mortality is attributed to laxity in enforcing vaccination, and especially re-vaccination, and to inadequate scrutiny of the results. A re-organisation of the vaccination staffs in Madras was sanctioned in 1918, and is probably now in working order. I would add that sanitation is a transferred subject under the new Indian Constitution, i.e., that it is no longer under my control.

SUKKUR BARRAGE SCHEME.

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India the names of the technical advisers who have reported in favour of the present Sukkur barrage scheme?

Mr. MONTAGU: I will consult the Government of India as to publication of

the official correspondence on this subject.

MUNITIONS DEPARTMENT, BENGAL (PROSECUTION).

Sir F. HALL asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that, in connection with proceedings instituted against two native merchants in the Chief Presidency Magistrate's Court for extensive frauds against the Munitions Department, the case was withdrawn on 5th August by the Bengal Advocate-General; the grounds on which this course was followed, and by whose instructions; and what was the amount of the expenditure incurred by the Indian Government in working up a case in which, according to the Advocate-General, the guilt of the accused persons was as clear as a bell?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have seen statements on this matter in the Press, and have telegraphed for information.

PORT OF CALCUTTA (PENSIONS).

Major MORRISON-BELL asked the Secretary of State for India if, in view of certain recent additions to the scale of pensions for certain classes of Indian civil servants and in view of the fact that the Port of Calcutta Trust have stated that they are unable to similarly increase the pension scale without instructions from the Government of India, it is the intention to issue any instructions or recommendations to this effect?

Mr. MONTAGU: I do not know what action, if any, has been taken by the Commissioners of the Port of Calcutta in the matter of increasing the pensions of their retired employés. They are a statutory body not governed by the rules of the Government Service. I will communicate the question of my hon. and gallant Friend to the Government of India for their consideration.

TRADE AND COMMERCE.

COTTON IMPORT DUTIES, INDIA.

Mr. SUGDEN asked the Secretary of State for India what immediate facilities will be given to a proposed deputation of Lancashire cotton employers and employés to the Government of India, to the Indian cotton traders, and the Indian Cotton Workers' Association on the subject of cotton import duties; and if any

Lancashire Members of Parliament accompany such deputation, may facilities be afforded them of debating the subject with the legislative councils of India?

Mr. MONTAGU: The Government of India have informed me that they welcome the proposed visit of the deputation, and will give them all the facilities they can. They assume that the deputation will make its own arrangements for meeting trade associations. If the visit to India takes place while the Legislative Assembly is in Session, the Government of India anticipate no difficulty in arranging for the delegation to meet members of the Assembly. I have taken steps to have this message communicated to representatives of the trade.

POST OFFICE.

INDIAN MAIL.

Lieut. - Commander KENWORTHY asked the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been drawn to the irregularity and constant delays in the delivery of the Indian mail in this country, which are causing inconvenience to persons having correspondence with India; and what are the terms, as regards time limits, of the present contract with the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company, Limited, for the carrying of the Indian mail and if they are being strictly complied with?

Mr. KELLAWAY: My attention has been directed to the irregularity and delay in the delivery of the Indian mail in this country; and, as I informed the hon. Member in answer to a recent question, it is hoped to secure greater speed and regularity before the end of this year. The present contract with the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation, Limited, provided for the conveyance of the mails from Bombay to Brindisi within a period of 270 hours, which is extended to 306 hours during the prevalence of the south-west monsoon. This service, however, was altered from time to time during the War, and the present arrangement provides for a service between Bombay and Marseilles. While the sea transit is performed at the best speed attainable, there is no specific requirement in regard to speed.

Thursday, 11th August, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

LAND REVENUE, MADRAS PRESIDENCY.

Sir J. D. REES asked the Secretary of State for India whether the land revenue of the Madras presidency, which was Rs.392 lakhs in 1891-92, is now Rs.620 lakhs; and whether this rise is due to any and, if so, what causes other than increase in the prices of agricultural products?

Mr. MONTAGU: The figures given in the question are correct. The figure for 1891-2 was, however, substantially lower than those for the years immediately preceding and following, the average at the time being about 430 lakhs. The principal causes of the increase in revenue are an increase in the cultivated area by about 12½ per cent. and increased assessments on resettled areas. The increase in the price of agricultural products is a main factor in the increased assessments, but I cannot say to what extent other factors may have operated.

CIVIL SERVICE.

Sir W. DAVISON asked the Secretary of State for India whether out of 88 candidates for the Indian Civil Service at the recent Civil Service examinations only 28 were Europeans; and, under these circumstances, will he inform the House what steps he proposes to take to restore the old prestige and popularity of the Indian Civil Service so that an adequate supply of British recruits may be forthcoming?

Mr. MONTAGU: I understand the hon. Member to refer to the number of candidates entered for the open competition of this year. The precise figures, according to my information, are 86 and 26, respectively. As regards the last part of the question, both Government and the universities take the view that there has not been time since the Armistice for the normal number of candidates to complete their preparation for the open competitive examination, and it must be remembered that the selection of ex-service candidates includes a number of candidates who would normally have

competed in the open competition. This selection of ex-service candidates is proceeding very satisfactorily, 26 such candidates having been, within the last few days, recommended by the Selection Committee as qualified for appointment.

Monday, 15th August, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

GREECE AND TURKEY.

54. **Mr. A. HERBERT** asked the Secretary of State for India if he is aware that there is considerable anxiety in India at the present moment due to the belief that Great Britain is not maintaining her pledged neutrality in the Turco-Greek war; and whether he will consider the advisability of publishing the Prime Minister's recent assertions of neutrality and his past pledges with regard to the homelands of the Turks, in India?

The **SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Montagu)**: The answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. All statements in the matter have already very wide publicity in India.

INDIA.

OPIMUM (EXPORT).

51. **Colonel Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India what steps the Government of India propose to take regarding the export of opium from India, owing to the failure of the Chinese Government to carry out her undertaking to put down the cultivation of opium in China?

Mr. MONTAGU: As the Chinese Government prohibited the import of opium into China in 1919, the Government of India are bound under The Hague Convention to prevent its export to China.

GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS (PASSAGES).

52. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India if he can now state the result of his communication with the Government of India with regard to the

cheapening of the cost of passages of Government officials to and from India?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am not at the moment in a position to make an announcement, as the matter is still under discussion.

ARMY (ESTABLISHMENT).

53. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India if he will publish as a White Paper the proposals submitted by the Commander-in-Chief in India for the establishment and number of units of the Indian Army to be maintained in India based on the detailed examination of what is required for the defence of India?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am afraid it is not clear to me what proposals my hon. and gallant Friend has in mind.

Lieut.-Colonel CROFT: Is it not the fact that certain reductions have taken place, and are taking place, and are these facts going to be brought before the House?

Mr. MONTAGU: Reductions have taken place in accordance with the statement I made to the House last February.

Lieut.-Colonel CROFT: Is it contemplated that any further reductions will take place, and is the Defence Committee reconsidering these reductions from the point of view of the strategic needs of the Empire as a whole?

Mr. MONTAGU: No further reductions will take place beyond those already sanctioned.

Sir C. YATE: Will the right hon. Gentleman refer to his previous reply to me, where he spoke of "The proposals submitted by the Commander-in-Chief in India"? Will he publish that?

Mr. MONTAGU: I do not know what my hon. and gallant Friend means by proposals submitted by the Commander-in-Chief in India. The reductions sanctioned already were reductions sanctioned on the proposals of the Government of India in which the Commander-in-Chief concurred. What further proposals my hon. and gallant Friend has in mind I do not know.

Lieut.-Colonel ARCHER-SHEE: Will the right hon. Gentleman say whether it is not the fact that proposals have been submitted, or are in course of being sub-

[Lieut.-Colonel Archer-Shee.]
mitted, for a reduction of the British Army in India by several units of infantry and some of cavalry?

Mr. MONTAGU: I understand that there has been a Committee sitting at Simla on the future of the Army in India, but no action will be taken on that, or nothing done in regard to it, until the whole matter has been considered by the Committee of Imperial Defence.

Lieut.-Colonel CROFT: Will the right hon. Gentleman give an undertaking that no further reductions will take place in India until this House has had the opportunity of saying something?

Mr. MONTAGU: That is, I think, for the Leader of the House to say. No further reductions will be sanctioned to those already sanctioned until the Committee of Imperial Defence has reported.

Lieut.-Colonel CROFT: In view of the fact that the matter has been referred to the Leader of the House, can we be informed by the right hon. Gentleman that no action will be taken in relation to the further reduction of the Army in India until the House meets again?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: I am sorry I did not hear what the hon. and gallant Gentleman said. I was discussing the business with my right hon. Friend, and did not hear the questions and answers. If the hon. and gallant Gentleman will put a question on the Paper, I will be glad to answer it.

MUNITIONS DEPARTMENT.

55. **Sir F. HALL** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he has received any reply to the telegram sent by him to India with reference to the withdrawal of the proceedings instituted against two native merchants in the Chief Magistrate's Court for extensive frauds against the Munitions Department; and, if so, what is the nature of such reply?

Mr. MONTAGU: I understand that telegraphic reports have reached the India Office, and are at the moment being deciphered. I have not yet seen the complete text.

Sir F. HALL: When will the information be forthcoming?

Mr. MONTAGU: If I can, I will circulate the telegrams in the OFFICIAL

REPORT to-night. If not, I hope to be in position to answer the question to-morrow.

Tuesday, 16th August, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

PUBLICITY DEPARTMENT, BENGAL.

1. **Sir J. D. REES** asked the Secretary of State for India whether the legislative council of Bengal has reconsidered or will reconsider its decision not to grant the funds required for a publicity department; and whether this subject can again be brought before the council in view of the crying need, to which the Governor has publicly testified, of the propagation of truth as regards matters of current controversy in India?

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Montagu): According to my information, the Council has not reconsidered its decision. And I read the Governor's speech, to which my hon. Friend refers, as indicating that he does not intend to have the matter brought before the council again until it is likely that the council has changed its opinion. He relies meanwhile on private efforts.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: Is it not a fact that the Legislative Council for Bengal itself is the best publicity organisation going?

Mr. MONTAGU: I do not know. I attach the greatest possible importance to the publication as widely as possible in India of the true facts.

NON-CO-OPERATION MOVEMENT.

2. **Captain Viscount CURZON** asked the Secretary of State for India whether at the bonfire of imported cloth recently organised by a Mr. Gandhi, a meeting took place at which this Mr. Gandhi and the two Ali brothers both spoke; whether this was in accord with the undertaking given to the Viceroy; and what was the nature of the speeches?

Mr. MONTAGU: In the accounts which I have received of the occurrence, there is no mention of any speeches having been made.

DEFENCE.

3. Colonel Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether, considering that there were in India and Aden, in 1914, 39 Indian cavalry regiments and 132 battalions of Indian infantry, he will now state what was the number of units of the Indian Army in India on the 23rd March, when he assured the House that no further reductions would be made in the Indian Army pending the result of the inquiry by the Sub-Committee of Imperial Defence; and what is the number of units, cavalry and infantry, respectively, of the Indian Army in India at the present time which are not under orders for disbandment?

Mr. MONTAGU: I regret that, owing to the constant fluctuation in the number of Indian units in India, due to the return of units from overseas and to disbandments in progress of units raised for the War, I cannot give the information asked for without a reference to India.

4. Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether, considering that the total expenditure of Japan on national defence is £108,000,000 and of India only £41,000,000, while the rate of expenditure on this account per head of the population works out at 21 rupees in Japan as compared with only 2½ rupees in India, he will now state what is the ratio of defence expenditure in India to the total gross revenues of India, including the receipts both of the Government of India and of all the different presidencies and provinces?

Mr. MONTAGU: The figures have, as I informed the hon. and gallant Member on 28th June last, been asked for from India. They have not yet been received.

Sir C. YATE: May I ask whether the right hon. Gentleman noticed in the papers that it is stated that the percentage of expenditure in India is 31 per cent., and, considering that Japan is spending 51 per cent. on national defence, will the right hon. Gentleman represent to the Government of India how very small their insurance for national defence is?

Colonel WEDGWOOD: Before the right hon. Gentleman answers that question, will he see that India does not copy Japan in the matter of armaments?

Sir C. YATE: May I have an answer to my question?

Mr. SPEAKER: It is an argumentative question, giving the hon. and gallant Member's opinion.

5. Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India what has been the result of the discussion at the Imperial Conference of the question of Empire naval policy and co-operation so far as India is concerned; and what steps will now be taken to give effect to Admiral Jellicoe's recommendations regarding the formation of an India Navy out of the present Royal Indian Marine?

Mr. MONTAGU: I would refer the hon. and gallant Member to the summary of the proceedings of the Imperial Conference which has been published in the Press, and to which I can add nothing. As regards the second part of the question, the position remains as I described it in my answer to the hon. and gallant Member's question of 11th April

MUNITIONS DEPARTMENT.

6. Colonel ASHLEY asked the Secretary of State for India whether the charge of fraud on a large scale, in connection with the Munitions Department, brought against two native merchants at the chief presidency magistrate's court, Calcutta, was withdrawn last week by the advocate-general, Bengal, though a large sum of public money had been spent in preparing the case; whether the advocate-general stated that in the opinion of the Indian Government the accused were guilty, but that if the prosecution proceeded widespread commercial and industrial interests would be seriously affected by reason of the association of the two accused with various business concerns, many of a Swadeshi boycott character; and will he state why the Indian Government have allowed political considerations to defeat the administration of justice?

Mr. MONTAGU: The facts appear to be as stated in the first three parts of my hon. and gallant Friend's question. I am circulating a paraphrase of the telegraphic reports I have now received from the Government of India, from which it will be seen that Sir Thomas Holland, the member of the Viceroy's Executive Council in charge of munitions, authorised the withdrawal of the

[Mr. Montagu.]

case on his own responsibility after consultation with some of his colleagues, but not with the Viceroy. As has been stated in the Press, the decision was not known to the Viceroy until the withdrawal had actually taken place. The matter as reported is so serious that I am at once asking the Viceroy to communicate to Sir Thomas Holland certain questions in order to supplement the information I have received. As soon as I am in possession of the replies, they will be brought before His Majesty's Government, who will consider what action, if any, may be necessary. I trust the House will not desire to press the matter further until full information has been obtained.

Colonel ASHLEY: May we assume that the action has not the approval, as at present advised, of His Majesty's Government?

Mr. MONTAGU: The Viceroy has already expressed his disapproval of the action taken.

Colonel BURN: In the case of a European, who is also implicated in these speculations, will the charge against him be also withdrawn?

Mr. MONTAGU: I hope my hon. and gallant Friend will appreciate that two wrongs do not make a right. But I would urge that no further questions be asked at this juncture. Sir Thomas Holland is a member of the Government of India, and has earned the widest respect and confidence by his services up to the present time, and I want to be able to furnish the House of Commons with his own answer.

Sir C. YATE: Will the right hon. Gentleman make it quite clear that, in the withdrawal of this case, there was no wish to rehabilitate the value of the shares in the Swadeshi undertakings involved?

The following is the paraphrase of the telegraphic reports:

Four persons were accused in the Court of the Chief Presidency Magistracy, Calcutta, of conspiring to cheat the Government over the supply during wartime of wire rope of the value approximately of one lakh of rupees. Their names were: Karnani, a prominent banker; J. C. Banerji, a contractor; Waite, formerly Deputy-Controller of Munitions, Bengal Circle; and Stringer, a subordinate official.

As a result of the prosecution there were serious withdrawals of deposits in the Karnani Bank, which endangered its stability. Sir Thomas Holland received information at Calcutta that if the prosecution was continued the bank would fail and it would involve the ruin of more than 120 industrial concerns which Karnani financed. Before that there had already been some public agitation of which the implication was that the Government in prosecuting these persons designed to destroy the credit of a new industrial bank actively engaged in financing Indian industries. There was danger of a great intensification of this agitation so as to cause racial ill-feeling, if in consequence of the continuance of the case several industrial concerns had collapsed, as seemed to be certain to result. Besides this, although the Government's legal advisers considered the case for prosecution sound and the evidence trustworthy, they also pointed out that the accused would be committed for trial to the High Court, that the trial would not be finished for many months, and that it was doubtful whether a jury in a complicated case of this character would convict. It is certain that the defence would have made a point with the jury of the public benefactions made by Karnani during the War. Thus on the one hand a conviction would seriously affect one section of the public, on the other a long trial followed by failure to secure a conviction from the jury would have similar disastrous results, and would appear to justify the feeling of bitterness and intensify it, and give rise to attacks on the Government on the ground that public funds had been unnecessarily wasted in the prosecution. Sir Thomas Holland for these reasons thought it wisest to withdraw the prosecution. Before reaching the decision he had consulted the members of the Government already familiar with the facts. But not the Viceroy, who states that he would not have consented to the case being withdrawn upon the ground stated by the Advocate-General. In the Court the Advocate-General made a statement of the charges in order to establish the fact that the Government were justified in launching the prosecution. The only ground for withdrawal which he stated in Court was that a net-work of industrial and commercial interests would be endangered. The terms of the statement made by the Advocate-General were not known to the other members of the Government who had been consulted about the withdrawal until they appeared in the Press.* It should be explained that certain civil claims had been made for about three lakhs of rupees on account of the supply of munitions by Karnani against the Government. Sir Thomas Holland had frequently been approached by many people influential in business and public life to withdraw the criminal case; but he had informed them that the Government would not consider such a withdrawal so long as these civil cases were threatened. Karnani subsequently withdrew these claims unconditionally. Sir Thomas Holland then took up the question

* The telegrams do not give the precise terms of the instructions given to the Advocate-General by Sir Thomas Holland.

of withdrawing the prosecution and decided as above stated. Of the accused, Waite is on bail in England, and is said to be dangerously ill. The charges against him stand good, but the subordinate, Stringer, has been discharged. The prosecution withdrawn has no connection with the charge against Blackburn and Michael of Spalding and Company, whose extradition from England was obtained last March, and who are now under trial in Calcutta, though Waite is accused in that case also.

Sir Thomas Holland accepts entire responsibility for the action taken. The Viceroy states in explanation of the failure to consult him that Sir Thomas Holland has been very gravely overworked having been in charge of Sir George Barnes' Portfolio in addition to his own since the latter left India, and that means were being sought to relieve the pressure on him before this occurred.

COAL EXPORTS.

8. Colonel WEDGWOOD asked the Secretary of State for India whether the export of coal from India without licence is still prohibited; and whether, in the interest of the Indian export trade and rupee valuation, this interference with trade will now be put an end to?

Mr. MONTAGU: The answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. As regards the second part, I have received a telegram from the Government of India saying that there is as yet no improvement in the situation as regards the supply of coal available. They regret, therefore, that they are at present unable to modify the restrictions on the export of coal.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: Is the right hon. Gentleman not aware that the difficulty in regard to the coal is largely due to the absence of trucks for the haulage of the coal; and what steps are the Government taking to increase the supply of trucks so that the mines can compete with the demand?

Mr. MONTAGU: One of the difficulties against which the Government of India has to contend is the imperfection of the transport system in India which they are doing their best to remedy; but it seems to me to be useless to suggest that coal can be exported when there is not a sufficient supply for the needs of India.

PRESS ACT.

9. Sir J. D. REES asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Government of India has decided as to the action to be taken upon the Report of the Committee appointed to examine the Press

Act and other enactments of the like character?

Mr. MONTAGU: I understand that the Government of India has come to a decision upon most of the recommendations, but I am not at present in a position to make any definite announcement in the matter.

CIVIL SERVICE (MEMORIAL).

10. Sir J. BRUTON asked the Secretary of State for India what decision has been arrived at by the Government of India on the memorial sent to him by the Indian Civil Service Central Association; and whether he will publish a copy of the comprehensive Resolution on the subject promised by the Government of India?

Mr. MONTAGU: I regret that the Government of India have not found it possible to issue the Resolution so soon as was hoped, but this will be done at the earliest possible moment, and its contents will be made available to the public here. My hon. Friend will no doubt appreciate the complexity of the issues involved.

GOVERNMENT OF BURMA.

7. Mr. R. GWYNNE asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the statement of the Government of India, in their telegram of 19th November, 1920, that the immediate application of the 1919 Act to Burma was an experiment fraught with great risks, for the consequences of which they could not accept any responsibility; but, in the event of the Secretary of State having finally decided that the Act should be applied to Burma, they urged that this should not be done by way of notification, but that their views should be laid before Parliament, who should express its approval by special enactment; whether this document was submitted to the Cabinet before it was decided to proceed to apply the Act by notification, and without consulting Parliament, against this expressed opinion of the Government of India; and, if not, what was the reason?

Mr. MONTAGU: The Government are, of course, aware of the statements quoted in the first part of the question, in consequence of which it was decided to proceed by Bill. But I invite the hon. Member's attention to the telegram dated

[Mr. Montagu.]
19th March last (No. 14 in Command Paper 1194), in which both the Government of India and the Burma Government urged that the principles contained in the Bill should be accepted with the least possible further delay. The recommendation of the standing Joint Committee was to the same effect, and the notification will produce exactly the same results as would have been produced by a Bill. I would also refer to the statement made by my right hon. Friend the Lord Privy Seal on the 9th August.

Mr. GWYNNE: Are we to understand from the right hon. Gentleman that the Government of India withdrew their former request to have their views brought before Parliament?

Mr. MONTAGU: The question was brought before the Houses of Parliament by the introduction of the Bill. The situation has been substantially altered by the more recent expression of opinion of the Government of India, and by the discussions of the Joint Committee.

Sir J. D. REES: Why is the Bill on the Paper still? It is on the Paper to-day.

Mr. GWYNNE: Did not the Government of India say that in any case they would like the views of the Houses of Parliament, and does the right hon. Gentleman suggest that, because a Bill was introduced, an expression of their views was thereby obtained?

Lieut.-Colonel ARCHER-SHEE: Is it not a fact that these matters of granting entirely different constitutions and Governments to the great Dominions of the British Empire ought of necessity to be brought before this House and properly discussed here, and not put through in this hole-and-corner way?

Mr. MONTAGU: I would remind the hon. and gallant Gentleman that this House and the other House decided by Statute that the new Province might be made by notification, and that is in accordance with the Statute. This Measure was introduced to the notice of Parliament because of a difference of opinion between the Government of India and the Secretary of State for India in Council. That difference of opinion has now been arranged, and it was thought by His Majesty's Government to be unnecessary

to proceed with the Statute referred to which would duplicate the Statute on the Statute Book.

Mr. GWYNNE: Does the right hon. Gentleman suggest that the mere notification of a Bill in this House really takes the opinion of the Houses of Parliament? Does he not realise that it is through the various stages of Measures that we get the opinion of the Houses of Parliament?

Mr. MONTAGU: My hon. Friend seems to forget that the very introduction of the Bill and its reference to a Joint Committee led from various reasons to the disappearance of all controversy, and that an agreement has been reached by the parties concerned.

Wednesday, 17th August, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

ARMY REDUCTIONS.

76. **Colonel Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India what was the total number of squadrons of Indian cavalry allotted for the purpose of internal security in India prior to the War; and what is the total number now allotted under the new scheme for the reduction of the Indian Army?

Mr. FISHER (*for Mr. Montagu*): I am sure my hon. and gallant Friend must see the disadvantages on military grounds of stating the allotment of the Army in India to its various duties on mobilisation.

80. **Sir G. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India if he will publish as a White Paper the proposals submitted by the commander-in-chief in India for the establishments and numbers of units in each arm which are to be maintained in India?

Mr. FISHER: I have in replies to questions on many occasions given the House all the information on this subject which I can usefully give before the Sub-committee of the Committee of Imperial Defence has considered the matter.

OFFICERS (JAPANESE LANGUAGE).

77. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India what further arrangements have been made to meet the financial difficulties of the officers of the Indian army studying Japanese in Japan?

Mr. FISHER: I regret that this matter has not yet been settled, though I hope it will be very shortly. As I informed my hon. and gallant Friend in the reply I gave to him on the 15th June, other Departments besides mine are interested.

FISCAL INDEPENDENCE.

78. **Sir J. D. REES** asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Government of India proposes to take any, and, if so, what, action to turn to practical account the large measure of fiscal independence which the British Parliament has added to the responsibilities of the reformed Indian legislatures?

Mr. FISHER: I am afraid I cannot forecast the future fiscal policy of the Government of India. In accordance with a Resolution of the Indian Legislative Council they are appointing a Commission to advise them on the subject.

MUNITIONS DEPARTMENT.

79. **Colonel BURN** asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been drawn to the withdrawal by the Advocate-General of Bengal of serious charges of fraud and forgery against one Sukhlal Kernani and others, involving large sums of money of which the Government were apparently defrauded during the War; whether he is aware that, in withdrawing these charges, the Advocate-General stated that they had been thoroughly investigated and could be proved up to the hilt against the accused, but that he was instructed by the Government of India to withdraw them because, if they were made good, certain so-called Swadeshi enterprises might suffer; whether he will explain upon what principle of law or justice the withdrawal of these serious charges is justified; and whether, notwithstanding the withdrawal of the case against the Indians involved, it is intended to proceed against certain Europeans who were also accused?

Mr. FISHER: I would refer the hon. and gallant Member to the answer that I

gave yesterday on this subject, and to the telegraphic statement printed in the OFFICIAL REPORT to-day.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

JUNIOR ARMY OFFICERS (LANGUAGE EXAMINATIONS).

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether it has been brought to his notice that the language examinations for junior officers in India have lately been made much more difficult, and that there is a widespread belief that these examinations are being used as a means to get rid of surplus officers without paying them their customary gratuities; and will he suggest to the Government of India that special consideration in the matter of these examinations should be shown to young officers of the Indian Army who were sent on active service directly after leaving Quetta College and have been almost continuously on service ever since, and who, although they have acquired a good colloquial knowledge of the language, have not had the opportunity of working up their books that has been enjoyed by others not employed on active service, with a view of saving officers who served with credit from being forced out of the service against their will?

Mr. MONTAGU: I was not aware that the examinations have been made more difficult. I am sure that my hon. and gallant Friend will agree with me that there can be no sort of foundation for the rumour which he brings to my notice. I will invite the special attention of the Government of India to his question.

SMALL-POX (VACCINATION).

Mr. HAYDAY asked the Secretary of State for India how long vaccination has been compulsory in the cities of Calcutta, Bombay, and Madras; and how many small-pox cases and deaths, respectively, occurred in each of those cities during the 10 years 1911-20?

Mr. MONTAGU: The following are the dates on which compulsory vaccina-

tion was introduced in the cities in question:—

Reference.

Calcutta—

26th May, 1880 ... Bengal Act 5 of 1880, Section 1, footnote.

Madras—

15th May, 1884 ... Madras Local Rules and Orders, page 857.

Bombay—

1st September, 1877 Bombay Act 1 of 1877, footnote.

The following are the figures for deaths so far as they are available. (No statistics of the numbers of cases are available):—

—	Calcutta.	Madras.	Bombay.
1911 ...	41	480	443
1912 ...	77	106	979
1913 ...	120	34	212
1914 ...	1,038	66	252
1915 ...	2,560	92	359
1916 ...	58	476	1,021
1917 ...	28	195	269
1918 ...	545	272	1,024
1919 ...	—	—	780

Indian sanitary authorities admit that compulsory vaccination has never been very rigorously carried out. The hon. Member will understand that the zenana system creates difficulties unknown in the West.

Mr. BROMFIELD asked the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been drawn to the large number of cases of and deaths from small-pox which occurred amongst Europeans and Indian troops in India during the year 1918, as follows: European troops 117 cases with 18 deaths; European officers, women, and children 33 cases with 5 deaths; Indian troops 329 cases with 46 deaths; making a total of 479 cases with 69 deaths; and what explanation the Army medical officers have to offer of the failure of vaccination and re-vaccination to protect these cases?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have been asked to reply. I have been unable to verify the figures given for European officers, women and children, but have no doubt

the hon. Member is correct. The other statistics agree with those in my possession. I have no information to show how many of the cases had been vaccinated. I will call for a report.

Thursday, 18th August, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

CIVIL SERVICE (PENSIONS).

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India if he has now received and considered the opinion of the Government of India on certain points regarding proportionate pensions for those members of the civil services of India to whom service under the reform scheme is not congenial but who cannot apply for permission to retire till they know the conditions of retirement that will be open to them; and, if so, can he state what decision he has arrived at?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have not yet received the reply of the Government of India on certain points of detail, but hope that it may be possible shortly to publish the definite terms.

PRE-WAR BATTALIONS (DISBANDMENT).

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India which of the pre-War infantry battalions of the Indian Army have been earmarked for disbandment; whether these disbanded battalions are to be replaced by fresh battalions, and, if so, how they are to be constituted; and, if these disbanded battalions are not to be replaced, whether this reduction will reduce the number of battalions below the 132 which he assured the House were to be maintained?

Mr. MONTAGU: Under the latest proposals of the Government of India, the following eight pre-War battalions will be disbanded:—

- 44th Merwara Infantry.
- 80th Carnatic Infantry.
- 3rd Brahmans.
- 5th Light Infantry.
- 42nd Deoli Regiment.
- 43rd Erinpura Regiment.
- 63rd Palamcottah Light Infantry.
- 88th Carnatic Infantry.

These will be replaced by eight battalions, namely, four battalions of Burma Rifles (composed of Burmans, Karens, Shans, Kachins, and Chins), two battalions of Kumaonis, an additional battalion of Carhwalis, and a battalion composed half of Christians and half of Mahars. At the risk of disappointing the hon. and gallant Member, I have to assure him that these proposals involve no breach of my undertaking.

NORTH-WESTERN FRONTIER (SITUATION).

Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS asked the Secretary of State for India whether he has yet received full reports as to the situation on the North-West Frontier and the causes and the results of the recent fighting there?

Mr. MONTAGU: Owing to the attitude of the Waziristan tribes towards us during the Afghan War, and the repeated raids which they carried out against the peaceful inhabitants of our frontier districts, in 1919 punitive operations were undertaken in Waziristan. These operations, after some severe fighting, led to the occupation of the country by our forces and the nominal submission of the tribes to the terms imposed upon them by us; but it could scarcely be expected that independent and warlike tribesmen, occupying a mountainous district roughly half the size of Switzerland, would be subdued and become peaceful cultivators and traders within a short space of time. In such a country it is to be expected that for some time certain sections will prove recalcitrant, refusing to comply with our terms and maintaining hostilities against us, in the hope of tiring us out and inducing us to withdraw before the terms of submission have been fully complied with. Their intimate knowledge of the intricate country in which they live, and through which our long lines of communication pass, favour such activities on their part. Moreover, there are various influences, such as the activities of Afghan adventurers, at work, instigating hostility and resistance; and the tribesmen, as a whole, cannot but be influenced by their anticipations regarding the outcome of the negotiations of our mission now in Kabul.

But in considering the pacification of Waziristan, the problem may conveniently be dealt with under three tribal headings—the Tochi Waziris, the

Mahsuds, and the Wana Waziris; remembering that of these the Mahsuds are the most turbulent, and that, therefore, their attitude influences largely the demeanour of the tribesmen as a whole.

The Tochi Waziris.

As soon as the expedition sent against them in 1919 had reached Datta Khel the Tochi Waziris tendered their submission. The terms imposed upon them were complied with in part, but on the withdrawal of our force from Datta Khel these tribesmen failed to complete the payment of the fines levied upon them or to hand in the balance of the rifles demanded. Their action may be attributed to their desire to await the result of the Kabul negotiations, and it is to be expected that raids by the Tochi Waziris will continue until Datta Khel is re-occupied by us, a proposal which is now being considered.

The Mahsuds.

As the result of our past operations in 1919-1920, all the Mahsuds have submitted to our terms except three sections of the tribe. These sections amount to between 2,000-3,000 fighting men out of a total Mahsud strength of 20,000, and, as they live in the more remote valleys, and have not yet received adequate punishment, they continue their raids and attacks upon convoys, though the fact that we have a brigade in the heart of the Mahsud country within shelling distance of Makin, their most important village, has already had the effect of bringing about an almost entire cessation of raids by Mahsuds in the Zhob and Dera Ismail Khan districts, which in the past were the cause of so much loss to the peaceful inhabitants of those areas.

Attacks by these recalcitrant sections upon our posts have almost invariably been unsuccessful, and their efforts are now chiefly confined to attempts against convoys, which offer greater prospect of success. A convoy moving through a mountainous country with its long line of animal transports is vulnerable and not easy to protect; but it is hoped that this difficulty will be greatly decreased when the road now being built to Ladha is complete, enabling mechanical transport to replace the long convoys of animals.

The Abdullais, the most truculent of these three recalcitrant sections of the Mahsuds, have, since our brigade near Makin shelled that place, sent in to ask

for a truce, and there are indications that they too are awaiting events in the hope that something to their benefit may result from the Kabul negotiations. Both the Tochi and Wana Waziris fear the Mahsuds, and, in addition to awaiting the outcome of events at Kabul, are reluctant to make any definite move until they see what our policy towards the Mahsuds is to be.

The Wana Waziris.

These tribesmen submitted to our terms without a punitive expedition being necessary, but owing to the intrigues of Afghan adventurers and recalcitrants amongst their own folk the peace party was over-ruled and operations against them had to be undertaken in December, 1920.

The fines then imposed upon them have been paid up in full, but many rifles yet remain to be handed in, and it is clear that they too are watching events at Kabul. At the same time it should be noted that their country was taken over by us at their own request in 1894 and the bulk of the tribe would be greatly averse to our withdrawal, and consequently they showed little activity against us.

In brief it may be stated that our present disposition in Waziristan gives us a good hold upon the country in general and that as communications improve that hold will become more firm, until in time the recalcitrant minority will see that their guerilla tactics are of no avail, the majority who are peacefully inclined will find employment in increasing numbers as Khassadars and Escorts and on road making, and eventually, it is hoped, the district will become peaceful and prosperous. In no circumstances could such a result be expected immediately after our punitive operations and under existing conditions the eventual pacification of the country has undoubtedly been delayed by the uncertainty of our position *vis-à-vis* Afghanistan and by the activities of Afghan adventurers.

MR. GHANDI.

Viscount CURZON asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been drawn to a declaration made by Ghandi to the effect that he can clearly see the time coming when he must refuse obedience to every single state-made law, even though there may be certainty of

bloodshed; whether this statement is equivalent to a declaration of open rebellion; whether the same individual is directly or indirectly responsible for most of the revolutionary disturbances which have taken place in India during the last few years; and, if so, what action he now proposes to take?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have seen the Press extracts to which the question refers. I would call the noble Lord's attention to the answer I gave him on the 6th April and the 12th July, and also to my answers to the hon. Member for Eastbourne (Mr. Gwynne), on the 17th and 24th November last with regard to the last part of the question. I will send the noble Lord copies of these replies.

SURPLUS BRITISH CAVALRY OFFICERS.

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India if he can now state how many British officers of each rank of the Indian Army it is estimated will have to be discharged as surplus to requirements owing to the proposed reductions; and what provision is to be made for these officers to enable them to start life afresh?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am afraid not. The Government of India have only just received a telegraphic summary of the recently published terms to be given to surplus British Service Cavalry officers. They will no doubt wish to take these into consideration before submitting their own proposals.

NATIONAL DEFENCE (ARMY REDUCTION).

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the fact that Japan is now spending 51·4 per cent. of the gross revenue of the country on national defence, while India, according to the latest Indian papers, is only spending 31·4 per cent. of her gross revenues for defence purposes, or just 1·4 per cent. more than her pre-War expenditure for this purpose, and that the Indian Army is being reduced far below the strength of the 340,000 men that were required to defend the country from invasion in 1919, while the military dangers now facing India are said to be far greater than they were during any year prior to 1914, he will call the attention of the Government of India to the inadvisability of proceeding with the reductions sanctioned by him on 23rd March,

pending full consideration of the situation by the Sub-committee of Imperial Defence?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am confident that the Government of India and their military advisers are fully alive to all relevant considerations.

PROVINCIAL LEGISLATIVE COUNCILS (MINISTERS' SALARIES).

Colonel WEDGWOOD asked the Secretary of State for India whether the various provincial legislative councils in India vote the salaries of ministers in charge of transferred subjects; and, if so, whether the Bengal legislative council has in this respect the same powers and the same practice as the other provincial councils?

Mr. MONTAGU: The answer to both parts of the question is in the affirmative.

NEWSPAPERS (Gwalior State).

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the fact that cases have occurred in which the sale and distribution of newspapers published in British India have been prohibited from entry into the territory of a native state without any further action being taken against those newspapers, he will state what the law is at present in British India on the subject; and, if not strong enough for action to be taken against such papers, will he have the necessary measures taken to strengthen the law?

Mr. MONTAGU: My hon. and gallant Friend will find the law on the subject laid down in several Indian Acts which cannot easily be summarised. I would refer him to my answer to his former question on the 21st June, to which I need add only that in any revision of the law which is undertaken I have no doubt full attention will be directed to the desirability of fixing personal responsibility for scandalous statements as well as to removing restrictions which are held to impede the expression of fair and honest opinion.

MILITARY OFFICERS (CIVIL APPOINTMENTS).

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India if he has now considered the question of reducing the minimum pay of Rs.3,000 to Rs.2,500 per mensem as a condition for granting an additional pension of £100 a year to Army officers who

have held high civil appointments in India; and, if so, what decision he has arrived at?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have considered the point raised by my hon. and gallant Friend, but do not consider it necessary to take any further action. Rs 3,000 per mensem is, generally speaking, the lower limit of salary in those civil appointments held by military officers which are above the ordinary line and only held by selected officers. Rs.2,500 is in some cases within the time scale, and does not in any service represent what may be attained by the most meritorious officers. To reach it cannot be taken as an indication of special merit.

Friday, 19th August, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

ARMY OFFICERS' PENSIONS.

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India if he can now publish the amendments lately sanctioned by him to the rules regarding the pensions of senior officers in the Indian Army?

Mr. MONTAGU: It has not been considered necessary to issue a Press communiqué in this country, but the Government of India have been authorised to publish a supplementary Army Instruction embodying the recent decisions regarding the rates of pension admissible to colonels and general officers of the Indian Army. Officers in this country can be supplied with an explanatory memorandum on making application to this Office.

MILITARY AND RIVER POLICE, BENGAL.

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India if, as reported in the Calcutta papers, the Government of Bengal have accepted the proposal, moved by Babu I. B. Dutt in the Bengal Legislative Council, to appoint a committee of five non-official and two official members to inquire, amongst other things, into the abolition of the military and river police; and whether he will take the necessary steps to secure the safety and security of Bengal from being imperilled?

Mr. MONTAGU: I cannot find that I have received any information upon this subject. I understand from the question that nothing further has been accepted than the appointment of a committee of inquiry. The protection of Bengal is, I am sure, safe in the hands of its Government.

IMPERIAL POLICE.

Sir G. WILLS asked the Secretary of State for India whether the increased pay sanctioned for the Indian Imperial Police early in 1919 was intended to include overseas pay; if so, how is it that officers appointed in India, and therefore ineligible for overseas pay, actually drew the full scale of pay until 1st January, 1920, when the second scale, which included overseas pay, was sanctioned; and whether, owing to the deduction of overseas pay from their salaries, officers of the Indian Imperial Police appointed in India are now drawing less pay than they would have done had the old graded scale remained in force?

Mr. MONTAGU: The scale sanctioned with effect from 1st January, 1919, was arrived at as a scale applicable to all officers in the police, whether appointed in the United Kingdom or in India, before the principle had been definitely accepted that the pay of the Imperial Services should be fixed on an Indian basis, and that the additional amount required to obtain recruits from the United Kingdom should take the form of overseas allowance. Officers of Indian domicile were thus given the benefit of it like others. As regards the last part of the question, the answer is in the negative, as all officers who were in the police prior to the introduction of the new scale, whether appointed in India or in the United Kingdom, have, since the 30th April, been granted overseas allowance, in addition to their pay.

Sir G. WILLS asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the greatly increased cost of medical attendance, surgical operations, and treatment in nursing homes, he will consider the question of rendering assistance to officers of the Indian Imperial Police who, in consequence of loss of health in the performance of their duties, are sent home on sick leave?

Mr. MONTAGU: I regret that I do not see my way to make a practice of assisting

officers of the Indian Imperial Police or other Civil Services in India who are on sick leave in this country to meet the increased medical charges, which are not unusual now.

Wednesday, 19th October, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS (*by Private Notice*) asked the Leader of the House whether his attention has been called to the decision of the Government to provide facilities for a Debate on the position of affairs in India in another place; and whether he does not think this House is equally entitled to deal with important questions that await decision?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (Leader of the House): I have noticed what took place in another place yesterday, but I hope I shall not be pressed at present to give a promise of further facilities with regard to days for the discussion of subjects other than unemployment in this House. My hon. Friend is aware, of course, that it is necessary to proceed as quickly as possible with Measures dealing with the question of unemployment, and I can only say now that the Government will give every consideration to my hon. Friend's proposal as soon as the various stages of the Bills to be dealt with can be completed in this House. I was asked to provide days for so many subjects yesterday that were I to comply with them all the re-opening of the old Session would be like the opening of a new Session, with a Debate, before any business was done, of the length of an ordinary Debate on the King's Speech at the beginning of a fresh Session.

Colonel Sir C. YATE: Does that mean that all stages of the Unemployment Bills are to be completed before any other questions can be touched upon?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: I think that is desirable. It is just conceivable, of course, that in the ordinary course of business there might be an interval which might be fruitfully occupied in the consideration of some other matter, and I am considering the various suggestions

which were made yesterday, but the House is asked to sit because of the urgency of the unemployment question, and I think it would be the desire of the whole House that our attention should be primarily directed to that.

Thursday, 20th October, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

FISCAL COMMISSION.

Mr. WADDINGTON asked the Secretary of State for India whether any additional appointments representing the Home Government can be made on the Indian Fiscal Commission to secure ample consideration being given to all the trade interests involved; and whether it is proposed to take any evidence in the United Kingdom, in view of the great need that the decisions of the Commission shall promote the mutual benefit of the United Kingdom and India?

Mr. MONTAGU: No, Sir. The Commission has been appointed by the Viceroy who, I think, has taken care to secure a representative Commission. It is for the Commission to decide its own procedure, but I do not think it will find it necessary to take evidence here.

Mr. WADDINGTON asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to a recent speech by the Viceroy of India at Simla stating that the Indian Fiscal Commission was appointed to consider the imposition of duties for purposes of protection as well as revenue; whether this represents the opinion of the Home Government; and will representation be made to extend the terms of reference to include the consideration of Free Trade between India and the United Kingdom?

Mr. MONTAGU: The terms of reference to the Commission are "to examine, with reference to all the interests concerned, the tariff policy of the Government of India, including the question of the desirability of adopting the principle of Imperial preference, and to make recommendations." I have seen the speech by the Viceroy to which my hon.

Friend refers. The terms of reference clearly include the consideration of the policy of Free Trade between India and the United Kingdom as well as of the policy of Protection.

RAILWAY ADMINISTRATION.

Sir T. BENNETT asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the evidence furnished to the Committee on the administration and working of Indian railways of the bitter feeling aroused in millions of third-class passengers by overcrowding and other discomforts, and also in view of the evidence that Indian agriculture, trade, and industry are subjected to prolonged delay, serious financial loss, and in cited instances to entire exclusion from seasonable markets, through inadequacy of rolling stock and equipment, the Government of India intend to take early measures for remedying the most serious of the shortcomings testified to before the Committee, without waiting to come to a decision on the larger questions of railway policy and finance dealt with in the Report?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have already suggested to the Government of India that action should be taken without delay on the lines indicated in my hon. Friend's question.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS (PURCHASE OF STORES).

Sir T. BENNETT asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been directed to a statement made by the Governor of Bombay to a deputation from the Indian Merchants' Chamber to the effect that the local governments had not been completely free in the matter of the purchase of stores on account of the stores rules, but that the rules had been altered on the recommendation of the Government of India and now only awaited the Secretary of State's sanction; whether this sanction had been given; and whether Sir George Lloyd's anticipation that in a week or two the local government would be completely free in this matter has been realised?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have not seen the statement referred to. The Government of India have, I understand, consulted Provincial Governments regarding the revision of the rules for the purchase of stores. I have not yet received the final views of the Government of India.

Monday, 24th October, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

FIELD SERVICE BATTAL.

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India what batta is to be granted to the troops engaged in the Arghanistan operations of 1919 and in the Waziristan and Mahsud operations operating during 1919-20 and 1921?

Mr. MONTAGU: If my hon. and gallant Friend refers to field service batta for Indian troops as laid down in Indian Army Regulations, I feel sure that it has been drawn for all the operations mentioned. If the reference is to the grant of some special gratuity, the Government of India have not proposed any such grant.

CIVIL SERVICE CANDIDATES.

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India how many of the candidates at the last examination for appointment to the Indian Civil Service were British and how many were Indian?

Mr. MONTAGU: There were 52 Indian candidates, 16 Europeans and Anglo-Indians, and five candidates from Ceylon, making a total of 73.

Tuesday, 25th October, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

CIVIL SERVICE (PROPORTIONATE PENSIONS).

1. **Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS** asked the Secretary of State for India when he will be prepared to make his statement in regard to proportionate pensions for members of the Civil Service who desire to retire owing to lack of confidence in the present method of ruling India; and what is delaying the publication of these terms?

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Montagu): I hope to make the

announcement this week. The delay, which has been greater than I originally hoped, is solely due to consultation with the Government of India on the numerous points of detail which have arisen out of this very important and intricate matter.

Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS: As the right hon. Gentleman's pledge to me was given in this House, does he propose to make a statement in the House, or to publish it in the Press?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am afraid it will be a very long communiqué, because it deals with the details of various services. As soon as I have arranged with the Government of India the exact language, the best plan will be for me to communicate with my hon. Friend, who takes an interest in this matter, and ask him to put an unstarred question which, with the answer, will then be on the records of the House.

MOPLAH REBELLION.

2. **Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is prepared to make a full statement of the troubles arising from the Moplah rebellion; and whether he is satisfied that steps have been taken to protect the lives and property of His Majesty's subjects in the event of risings in other parts of India?

3. **Sir J. D. REES** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he can give the House any information regarding the situation in Malabar?

7. **Captain Viscount CURZON** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he can state the number of casualties due to revolutionary violence in India during the War; and what is the present state of affairs in the Moplah area?

Mr. MONTAGU: As the House is, I think, aware, I have already published and am publishing all the information in regard to these disturbances as I receive it by telegram from India. I think, however, that that information should be brought officially before the notice of the House, and to that end I am having prepared and hope to present within the next few days a White Paper containing the essence of the reports I have received. I fear that, owing to the inherent difficulties of the country, we must anticipate that the operations required to put an

end to the disturbances may take some little time. I will, of course, keep the House informed as to their progress, and propose to supplement the White Paper from time to time as may be necessary.

With regard to the last part of question No. 2, the Governments in India have the fullest sense of their responsibility for the lives and property of those with whose protection they are charged. I would refer the hon. Baronet to the statement made by the Viceroy in the Council of State on the 3rd September, of which I will send him a copy. As regards the first part of question No. 7, I am not able to supply figures as to the number of persons whose death or injuries may have been attributable to revolutionary violence as distinct from ordinary crime during the period of the War. But information contained in the Report of the Sedition Committee, Command 9190 of 1918, will perhaps partially meet the Noble Lord's purpose. I will send him a marked copy.

Sir J. D. REES: In the White Paper that the right hon. Gentleman proposes to lay on the Table will he give information regarding the forcible conversion of Hindus to Mohammedanism, as to which information is rather wanting?

Mr. MONTAGU: I cannot speak from memory. What I propose to publish as a White Paper is a collection of the telegrams I have received. As my hon. Friend knows, there has been a considerable number of forcible conversions.

Colonel Sir C. YATE: Can the right hon. Gentleman state how many troops and armed police are employed in this Moplah area?

Mr. MONTAGU: I cannot state that I am not sure whether, on reflection, the hon. Baronet will think that it would be wise to give the information. All troops that are necessary and for which the Government of Madras has asked have been sent.

Captain EDGE: Does the unfortunate rising among the Moplahs not prove the necessity of keeping a firm hand on India and of preventing agitators from this country spreading discontent among the natives? Has not the time arrived for a seizure of arms in India?

Mr. MONTAGU: There never has been any doubt that it is the duty of the Government to deal firmly with outbreaks such as the Moplah rebellion.

PUBLICITY BUREAU.

4. **Sir J. D. REES** asked the Secretary of India whether the Government of India has taken any steps for giving the public throughout the Empire correct information on public questions; and whether a system of communication through the different grades of officials down to the village officers can be elaborated, in view of the need of counteracting seditious propaganda?

Mr. MONTAGU: The Government of India, through their Central Publicity Bureau, which is supplemented by certain Provincial Bureaux, have developed a system by which information as to public questions is widely circulated in the Indian Empire, the measures taken by Government being in particular explained. Besides the communiques which are constantly appearing in the public Press, a very large number of leaflets and similar documents are issued. Copies of many of these are on record at the India Office, and I shall be glad to send the hon. Baronet a selection if he so requires. As regards their distribution, there are in Madras, for instance—I quote Madras because I have information for that Province—many thousand honorary correspondents of the Publicity Bureau who work in conjunction with the Provincial Publicity Bureau, so that the information may reach remote villages. The Government have, moreover, suggested to their officers that they should remove misapprehensions, correct misstatements, or refute disloyal and seditious propaganda.

SURPLUS OFFICERS.

5. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India what are the terms given by the Home authorities to surplus officers to retire; and when the terms to be offered by the Indian Government to surplus officers of the Indian Army, which it is stated are likely to compare favourably with those given by the Home authorities, will be published?

Mr. MONTAGU: The terms given to surplus British Service cavalry officers were announced in Army Order 320 of

[Mr. Montagu.]

July last, and were published in the Press at the same time. The terms offered by the Admiralty to naval officers are given in Admiralty Order 1056 of 1920, and were, I think, also published in the Press. I do not think I need recapitulate either set of terms here, as they are somewhat lengthy and technical. I hope it may be possible to announce the terms to be given to surplus Indian Army officers in the course of the next month.

Sir C. YATE: Can the right hon. Gentleman assure us that the Indian terms will compare favourably with those given by the Home authorities?

Mr. MONTAGU: As the hon. Baronet knows, there are great differences between the services. I would rather have notice of the question, so that I can give a considered reply.

NATIVE TROOPS (PROTECTION).

6. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that the loyal Indian soldier and his family at his home are now being persecuted almost beyond endurance by anti-Government agents; that canal officials refuse him water for his crops, buniyas refuse him food, and the loafers in the bazaar revile him because he is loyal to the British raj; and if he can state what steps are being taken in India to protect the soldier and punish his persecutors?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have not received any reports of the nature referred to; but I am bringing this question to the notice of the Government of India.

BENGAL POLICE.

8. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India what action is to be taken by the Government of India, in view of the fact that the Bengal Legislative Council have passed a resolution that no further appointments of British officers be made to the Bengal police?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have not received a report of any such resolution, but in any case no action could be taken on it by the Government of India, as recruitment for the Superior Police Service is controlled by the Secretary of State in Council, who makes all appointments to it.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

DISTURBANCES, TRIVANDRUM.

Sir J. D. REES asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Government of Madras has intervened in the situation arising from the endeavour of the students of Trivandrum College to intimidate the Travancore Durbar into increasing the very large proportion, 13 per cent., of the total revenue already spent upon education; and whether the agitators at the back of the students have been discovered and deported from the State?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have seen in the newspapers reports of recent disturbances at Trivandrum in connection with an agitation for the reduction of fees at the college, but I have no official information on the subject.

Wednesday, 26th October, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

MUNITIONS PROSECUTION.

Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is prepared to make a full statement as to the munition case in India and the resignation of Sir Thomas Holland; and whether no steps can be taken to reopen the matter?

Mr. MONTAGU: A full statement as to these matters was issued by the Government of India on the 28th August last and communicated to the Press in this country. I shall be glad to supply a copy of the statement, to which I have nothing to add, to the hon. Baronet. As stated in the communiqué, the decision to withdraw from the prosecution in the case was irrevocable.

MOPLAH REBELLION.

95. **Major M. WOOD** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he can make a statement as to the Moplah rising?

Mr. MONTAGU: I would refer the hon. and gallant Member to the reply I gave to the hon. Member for Twickenham (Sir W. Joynson-Hicks) yesterday.

Friday, 28th October, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

ARMY OFFICERS.

Commander BELLAIRS asked the Secretary of State for India whether it has been decided to retire young officers from the Indian Army who have not passed the advanced language examination; whether he is aware of the grave injustice to those officers who, owing to active service on the frontiers, have not been able to get the tuition from instructors who were at the disposal of officers in peace stations; that they cannot get leave to go where they can study and pass the necessary examinations; and whether he will make representations in this matter?

Mr. MONTAGU: Under Indian Army Regulations an officer of the Indian Army must pass the examination in higher Hindustani within three years from the date of his appointment in order to qualify for retention in the service. An application for extension of the time limit is permissible under special circumstances, if the officer is prevented from passing by causes beyond his control. I feel sure that the Government of India have not worked this rule to the unfair disadvantage of officers, but I will ask for their views in the matter.

VILLAGE INDUSTRIES.

Sir J. D. REES asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the scheme for the promotion of village industries promoted by the Governor, Lord Sinha, in Behar; and whether he has information that it is meeting with success in that province and is being introduced into other provinces?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have not seen the scheme referred to. As my hon. Friend is no doubt aware, the development of industries is a transferred subject.

Monday, 31st October, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

SEDITIONOUS LEAFLETS.

76. Colonel Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India what steps have been taken to put a stop to the circulation of leaflets in India tampering with the loyalty of the Indian Army; how many of the authors and printers of these leaflets have been prosecuted, and with what result; and whether any of those who signed these leaflets have been allowed to go free?

Mr. PARKER (Lord of the Treasury): I have been asked to answer this question. My right hon. Friend is consulting the Government of India as to the answer to this question. Perhaps my hon. and gallant Friend will repeat it next week.

MOPLAH REBELLION.

77. Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India how many Hindus have been forcibly circumcised and converted to Mohammedanism during the Moplah rebellion in Malabar?

Mr. PARKER: Various estimates have appeared in the Press. My right hon. Friend has no accurate figures. But there is no doubt that the Moplah fanatics now in rebellion have perpetrated the most terrible cruelties on their victims and that there have been many forcible circumcisions.

Sir C. YATE: Will the hon. Member endeavour to get the figures?

Sir J. D. REES: Can particulars be got in answer to the question I have put down for next Tuesday?

Mr. PARKER: I will ask my right hon. Friend.

Captain GEE: Can the hon. Gentleman say if the disloyalty in India among the Moplahs is not directly due to the disloyal speeches of two Members of this House during their recent visit to India?

LAHORE (FIRE BRIGADE SUPERINTENDENT).

78. Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether Mr. Newland,

[Sir C. Yate.]

an ex-soldier and the superintendent of the Lahore municipal fire brigade, was ordered by the municipal committee of Lahore to wear khaddar uniform, that is, uniform made of Gandhi's homespun cloth, the badge of disloyalty to the British Government, and was compelled to resign his appointment in consequence; and, if so, what steps have been taken by the Government of India in the matter and what provision has been made for Mr. Newland?

Mr. PARKER: I have seen nothing but a newspaper report of this occurrence. I am telegraphing for information.

Tuesday, 1st November, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

BUDGET (COUNCIL OF STATE).

1. **Sir J. D. REES** asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Standing Order disallowing discussion on the Budget in the Council of State is still in force?

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Montagu): As far as I am aware, the answer is in the affirmative.

INDIAN STUDENTS (UNITED KINGDOM).

2. **Sir J. D. REES** asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Committee to examine the conditions of Indians in the United Kingdom has reported, or what is the present position in this behalf?

Mr. MONTAGU: The Committee appointed under Lord Lytton's chairmanship to examine the question of Indian students in the United Kingdom is still sitting. It will report on the results of the evidence which it has so far been able to take in this country. I shall be glad to send my hon. Friend a copy of correspondence on the matter between Lord Lytton and myself, which has already been communicated to the Press.

BOLSHEVIK POSITIONS (BOKHARA AND AFGHANISTAN).

3. **Sir J. D. REES** asked the Secretary of State for India what positions, if any, are occupied at present by the Bolsheviks in or near the borders of Bokhara and Afghanistan.

Mr. MONTAGU: The posts held by the Bolsheviks in a military sense are, as far as is known, the same as those originally held by Czarist Russia, such as Khushk, Termez, Kalla-ba-Panjā, etc. Bokhara itself is normally independent, but has become, as the hon. Member is doubtless aware, part of the Russian Soviet Federation.

SELF-GOVERNMENT (EXTENSION).

4. **Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he has received any communication from the Government of India in reference to the proposals made in the Legislative Council at Simla for an extension of self-government to India before the period of 10 years contemplated by Section 41 of The Government of India Act, 1919, has elapsed?

Mr. MONTAGU: The resolution reported by Reuter as having been passed by the Legislative Assembly has not yet been officially communicated to me.

Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS: Having regard to the extreme seriousness of this matter, will the right hon. Gentleman consider the advisability of utilising the Joint Select Committee on Indian Affairs, which has been set up for this very purpose?

Mr. MONTAGU: Certainly, the Joint Committee can consider any question it desires, and particularly this question. I am not aware of anything in the Statute which would prevent the appointment of a Commission. The view I have always taken on this matter was expressed by me in the Debate on the Government of India Act.

Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS: That is to the effect that it is not desirable to deal with this matter until after the Commission which has to go out to India has reported, after 10 years have elapsed?

Mr. MONTAGU: In my view it will not be possible to consider amendment of the

Government of India Act until a Commission has visited that country.

PRESS ACTS.

5. Colonel Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India which were the local governments in India who expressed the opinion, recorded in the Report of the Committee appointed by the Government of India to examine the Indian Press Acts of 1867, 1908, and 1910, that the retention of the Act of 1910 was desirable in the interests of law and order; for what reason the Government of India propose to repeal these Acts, and in the case of seditious documents confiscated by order of the local government to allow the right of appeal, and to put the onus of proof that the document is seditious upon the local government instead of putting the onus of proving that the document is not seditious upon the owner or author; why the prescribed term of imprisonment is to be reduced; and why the Government of India desires to divest itself of the safeguards it now possesses against the spread of sedition just at the present time when sedition is so rife in India?

Mr. MONTAGU: I fear I could not give my hon. and gallant Friend the information for which he asks within the compass of an oral reply. I am therefore having a full statement prepared, and will circulate it when complete in the OFFICIAL REPORT.

The following is the statement mentioned:

All the local governments (except Madras and Bombay, which favoured repeal of the Press Act and the provision of safeguards of another kind) advocated the retention of the Press Act in some form. But, as stated in the Committee's report, there was considerable divergence of opinion between them as to the nature of the modifications which should be made.

It is not proposed to repeal the Act of 1867, and the repeal of the Act of 1910 is to be accompanied by the re-enactment, with certain modifications, of some of its provisions. One of the provisions to be retained is the power to order the forfeiture of seditious documents, and along with this it is also proposed to retain the right of appeal against such an order to a special bench of the High Court, which is allowed by the Act of 1910. The proposal

to place on the Government the onus of proving the seditious character of documents seized, is based on the general principle that the burden of proof lies on the prosecution and on the consideration that documents—the seditious character of which the Government is not in a position to prove—may reasonably and in general be assumed to be documents which do not seriously offend against the law of sedition.

As regards the third part of the question, the offences in respect of which it is proposed to reduce the maximum term of imprisonment from two years to six months, are not offences against the law of sedition, but breaches of the provisions of the Registration Act of 1867, such as failure to comply with the requirement of declaration of publishers' and printers' names and to display those names on published works. Such offences (which are commonly punished by fine and not by imprisonment) would seem to be adequately met by the reduced term of imprisonment when imprisonment is ordered.

As regards the last part of the question, the reasons for the proposals were given at length by the Committee, whose views the Government of India have accepted.

ARMY OFFICERS (PAY AND PENSIONS).

8. Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether he has now received the recommendations of the Government of India regarding the adjustment of the pay and pensions of those officers of the Indian Army who were retained in the Army on account of the War beyond the date on which they became due to be placed on the retired list; and what decision has been arrived at?

Mr. MONTAGU: The views of the Government of India on this subject have not yet been received. I have asked that I may have them at an early date.

Sir C. YATE: Shall we have the information before the end of the Session?

Mr. MONTAGU: That I cannot say, but I hope so.

EUROPEAN GOODS (BOYCOTT).

9. Mr. REMER asked the Secretary of State for India whether he can state the effect of Mr. Ghandi's agitation in

[Mr. Remer.]

favour of the boycott of British-made cloth; what effect this agitation has had on employment in the Lancashire and Cheshire cotton mills; whether he can make any general statement upon Mr. Ghandi's machinations; and if it is the intention of His Majesty's Government in India to arrest and deport this agitator?

Mr. MONTAGU: As regards the first two parts of the question, the Government of India have informed me that they see no reason to believe that the movement for the boycott of European goods is receiving, or is likely to receive, effective support from any large purchasing section of the community. As regards the last two parts of the question, I do not think that there is any general statement which I can make. Mr. Ghandi's proceedings are being closely watched by the Government of India, and they will decide whether, and when, any action should be taken in respect of them.

Captain Viscount CURZON: Does the right hon. Gentleman not think that his reply will still further add to the agitation, and will it not lead people still further to think that this fellow is a Mahatma?

Mr. MONTAGU: All that I have said in my reply is once more to announce the sound constitutional doctrine that it must be for the Government of India to decide when and how they will deal with these matters.

REPRESSIVE ACTS.

47. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Prime Minister whether, considering that the Moplah rebels are reported to be out for a general and merciless campaign of murder, looting, and forcible conversion, the Government will advise the Government of India not to proceed with their proposed Bill for the immediate repeal of certain repressive Acts that are now on the Indian Statute Book and thus to divest themselves of the powers to repress this or any other rebellion that they now have, especially as the Viceroy has expressed himself as conscious that the need of special powers may again arise in the future?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am in correspondence with the Government of India on the matter, and I can make no statement

at the present time. I would say, however, that I do not accept my hon. and gallant Friend's statement that the proposed Bill, if passed, would divest the Government of India of their powers to repress rebellion; and that the opinion he attributes to the Viceroy is in fact that of the Government of Behar and Orissa, as shown in paragraph 28 of the Repressive Laws Committee Report.

Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS: Having regard to the position of the English people in India, would the right hon. Gentleman arrange that this matter also should be referred to the Joint Select Committee on Indian Affairs, in order that they may consider whether it is desirable, in the interests of this country, that the legislation should be carried out?

Sir J. D. REES: Has not a specially appointed Committee recently reported on this matter, and did it not recommend the retention of some of these repressive Acts, or at least of one of them?

Mr. MONTAGU: I believe that the hon. Baronet is accurate, but I do not see how that affects the question which was put to me. With regard to the supplementary question put by the hon. Baronet the Member for Twickenham (Sir W. Joynson-Hicks) about the Joint Committee, I never undertook, when asking Parliament to agree to set up the Committee, that it should assist in the administration of India.

Sir C. YATE: Does the right hon. Gentleman consider it advisable that the Government should divest themselves of all powers of repressing rebellion?

Colonel WEDGWOOD: Was not this legislation intended to deal with intelligenzia, and not with Moplahs?

ARMY STRENGTH (IMPERIAL DEFENCE SUB-COMMITTEE).

51. **Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS** asked the Prime Minister if he will give the names of the members of the Sub-committee of Imperial Defence, to whom the question of the strength of the Army in India has been referred?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (Leader of the House): No, Sir. As has already been stated, it would be contrary to the usual practice to announce the membership of a Committee of this nature.

Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS: Does the right hon. Gentleman say that, when a great Imperial matter of this kind is referred to a Sub-committee of the Committee of Imperial Defence, there is no precedent for announcing the names? May the House of Commons not know who is to report on the vital question of the Army in India?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: I did not say that there was no precedent. I said that it was contrary to the usual practice. I believe that that practice has only once been departed from. In the opinion of the Government it is contrary to the public interest that they should be asked to disclose the names of members of the Committee of Imperial Defence or of Sub-committees of that body.

Sir C. YATE: Is the Committee now sitting?

EAST AFRICAN EXPEDITION, 1914.

6. Lieut.-Colonel CROFT asked the Secretary of State for India what action has been taken with regard to that high military official who was responsible for the ill-fated East African expedition in 1914, which was undertaken against the advice of the Commander-in-Chief in India and for which Colonel Aitken was allowed for so long to bear the blame?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am sure the hon. and gallant Member understands that these military operations were undertaken on the orders of His Majesty's Government at the time. This being the case, no question arises regarding the responsibility of any particular official.

Lieut.-Colonel CROFT: Is it not a fact that General Aitken, as he was at that time, was removed from his command, and has been unemployed ever since that date, although his immediate subordinates have been raised to extremely good positions in the Government?

Mr. MONTAGU: The hon. and gallant Gentleman asks me what action has been taken with regard to the high military official responsible for what he describes as "the ill-fated East African expedition in 1914." His Majesty's Government were responsible, and nobody else.

Lieut.-Colonel CROFT: The responsibility was fixed on General Aitken at the time for this failure. Can the right hon. Gentleman state who was responsible for this expedition and whether any action has been taken?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have said that the responsibility rested with His Majesty's Government.

Sir C. YATE: Can the right hon. Gentleman do anything to reinstate Colonel Aitken?

Mr. MONTAGU: There is another question on this subject.

7. Lieut.-Colonel CROFT asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that it is now a year since Colonel Aitken, commander of the East African expedition in 1914, was completely vindicated; that he then promised that steps would be taken at an early date suitably to recompense this officer; that he is suffering an unnecessary delay in the payment of his full pension; and nothing has been done by way of recompense?

Mr. MONTAGU: I regret the delay, but am now expecting a reply from the Government of India which will enable me to announce a decision.

Lieut.-Colonel CROFT: Will the right hon. Gentleman be able to give an answer before the House rises?

Mr. MONTAGU: I hope so. I expect to have the information to-day. If not, I will telegraph for it.

Lieut.-Colonel CROFT: I will put my question down again next week.

Wednesday, 2nd November, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

EX-SERVICE MEN.

INDIA OFFICE (LEGAL DEPARTMENT).

79. Sir S. HOARE asked the Secretary of State for India whether Mr. H. A. Painter was appointed to the Legal Advisers Department of the India Office on 19th September, 1921, at a salary of £200, rising to £250; whether Mr.

[Sir S. Hoare.]

Painter was unable to do any military service during the War owing to ill-health; and, if so, if he will explain why an opportunity was not given to ex-service men to apply for the post?

Mr. PARKER: The facts in regard to Mr. Painter are as stated. The vacancy was advertised, and a number of ex-service men were among the applicants. In considering the applications attention was paid to the special claims of ex-service men, some of whom were interviewed. It was decided to offer the appointment to Mr. Painter, as he was much the most suitable man for the post, for which special qualifications and experience were required.

Thursday, 3rd November, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS (PASSAGE RATES).

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India what steps have been taken to cheapen the cost of passages to and from India to Government officials in the service of the Government of India?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have not found it practicable to give the assistance referred to by the method of direct payments to officials. I am in communication with the Government of India as to the possibility of alleviating in some other manner the burden imposed on Government officials by the present high cost of passages, but I cannot be held to give any definite promise in the matter.

RICE (CONTROL).

Mr. T. GRIFFITHS asked the Secretary of State for India whether a public meeting of protest against the continued control of rice by the Burmese Government was recently held in Burma; whether there is a strong popular feeling against the continuance of the control; and whether he will now direct that the control be abolished?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have seen the report of a public meeting at Rangoon favouring a more stringent control of rice

than at present exists. I do not doubt that other meetings have favoured a relaxation of control, though I have not previously heard of them. I am in communication with the Government of India on the subject.

COLONISATION SCHEME, BRITISH GUIANA (DEPUTATION).

Sir J. D. REES asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in connection with the deputation from British Guiana which came to India at the end of 1919 to lay before the Indian Government a scheme for the colonisation of British Guiana by assisted emigration from India, the Indian Government has now ascertained that the Colonial Government is willing to undertake legislation assuring equal political rights to Indian emigrants; whether the Government of India has now decided to despatch a deputation to British Guiana to investigate local conditions and the suitability of the proposed colonisation scheme and to report whether further guarantees respecting the status of Indians are necessary; and, if so, of whom does such deputation consist?

Mr. MONTAGU: The answers to the first two parts of the question are in the affirmative. The deputation consists of Mr. G. F. Keatinge, I.C.S., Director of Agriculture, Bombay; Diwan Bahadur Keshava Pillai, Deputy President of the Madras Legislative Council; and Mr. Venkatesa Narayan Tewary, of the Servants of India Society.

Monday, 7th November, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

LAW AND ORDER.

34. Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS asked the Prime Minister whether his attention has been called to the Notice of Motion relating to India standing in the names of the hon. Member for Twickenham and others—[*“That this House views with grave concern the present state of India, and urges upon His Majesty’s Government to take immediate steps to re-establish law*

and order in that country"]—and when he will give a day for its discussion?

The LEADER of the HOUSE (Mr. Chamberlain): As this question relates to the business of the House, my hon. Friend will not be surprised if I answer it. I have seen the Notice of Motion, to which, in view both of the importance of the subject and the number of signatures attached to it, His Majesty's Government have given careful consideration. I should be glad if my hon. Friend would be good enough to confer with me before taking further action.

Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS: Will it be convenient for my right hon. Friend to see myself and two or three of my friends this afternoon?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: Yes; I am at my hon. Friend's disposal immediately after questions.

BASANTE KUMAR ROY.

66. Colonel Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether he will take steps to see that Basante Kumar Roy, described in the Press as de Valera's emissary to India, is not granted permission to return from America to India in the same manner as permission was granted to Lajpat Rai?

Major BARNSTON (Comptroller of the Household): If my right hon. Friend has occasion to deal with any application for permission to return to India, he will consult the Government of India as to the best method of doing so.

AUXILIARY FORCE.

67. Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India what was the total number of men enlisted in the Indian Auxiliary Force up to the 30th September, 1921, at the end of the first year of the existence of this force; and what is the estimated number of men in the country available for enlistment who have so far refused to enlist voluntarily?

Major BARNSTON: The total number of men enrolled in the Auxiliary Force up to 30th September was 29,750, and my present information is that the strength of the force now exceeds 30,000. As regards the second part of the question, the number of men available cannot be

accurately gauged, as availability is dependent on occupation and other causes.

PROSECUTION (BHAGALPUR).

68. Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India who were the local officials of Bhagalpur who were responsible for the prosecution of Mr. Grant in the case in which the court entirely exonerated Mr. Grant, and animadverted upon the unsatisfactory manner in which the case had been investigated by the Bhagalpur authorities; and what steps have been taken by the Government of India in the matter?

Major BARNSTON: The Government of Bihar and Orissa rightly took a very serious view of the murder by villagers of Gurkha watchmen engaged by Mr. Grant and instituted these prosecutions. The persons accused of taking part in the assault on the Gurkhas were charged with murder, riot and dacoity; the Messrs. Grant with organising an unlawful assembly; and the Gurkhas and villagers who accompanied them with forming an unlawful assembly. My right hon. Friend has not received a report of the judgment, which, he understands, entirely exonerated the Messrs. Grant. The case was one in which a full magisterial inquiry was very desirable. My right hon. Friend does not know that the Government of India has taken any action.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

CIVIL SERVICE PENSIONS (PREMATURE RETIREMENT).

Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is now in a position to state the conditions which have been arrived at by the Government of India for the issue of proportionate pensions to those members of the Indian Civil Service who do not see their way to serve under the present conditions in that country?

Mr. MONTAGU: The following Resolutions are being issued by the Government of India, with my approval, on the

8th November dealing with this and connected matters:—

RESOLUTIONS ISSUED ON 8TH NOVEMBER, 1921,
BY THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA WITH THE
APPROVAL OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE IN
COUNCIL.

I.

In their Report on Clause 36 of the Bill of 1919 the Joint Committee observed:—

“The Committee think that every precaution should be taken to secure to the public servants the career in life to which they looked forward when they were recruited, and they have introduced fresh provisions into this Clause to that end. If friction occurs a readjustment of persons and places may often get over the difficulty, and the Governor must always regard it as one of his most important duties to establish a complete understanding between his Ministers and the officers through whom they will have to work. But if there are members of the service whose doubts as to the changes to be made are so deeply rooted that they feel they cannot usefully endeavour to take part in them, then the Committee think it would only be fair to those officers that they should be offered an equivalent career elsewhere, if it is in the power of His Majesty's Government to do so, or, in the last resort, that they should be allowed to retire on such pension as the Secretary of State in Council may consider suitable to their period of service.”

The principle embodied in this recommendation, namely, that public servants, the conditions of whose employment have been altered by the constitutional changes introduced by the Act of 1919, could not in certain circumstances fairly be required to continue in the service of the Crown in India, was accepted by the Secretary of State. The detailed orders necessary to give effect to it have since been the subject of prolonged consideration by the Government of India and the Secretary of State, and the Government of India are now in a position to announce the decision of the Secretary of State in Council regarding applications for permission to retire prematurely, and the terms which will be granted to officers whose applications are accepted by the Secretary of State. In framing these terms the object aimed at has been to secure as just a mean as can be devised between an offer which is open to the criticism that few of those in whose interests it is made can afford to avail themselves of it, and one so liberal as to seem unfair to those who are willing to remain and play their part in the new order, and, while duly recognising the claims of loyal and meritorious service which might have continued, both to the public advantage and to the increasing credit of the officer himself, to avoid unjustifiable addition to the non-effective charges which have to be met from Indian revenues.

2. The constitutional changes introduced by the Act of 1919 have effected the structure of the Central Government and that of the Provincial Governments unequally. The Central Government is still an official Government, responsible to the Secretary of State and to Parliament, and there has been

no such alteration in the conditions of service of officers employed under it as would justify a relaxation of the rules governing retirement and pensions. For the present, therefore, and pending any further constitutional developments which may affect the character of the Central Government, applications for permission to retire prematurely in consequence of reforms will be considered only if received from officers who—

(1) are members of the following services—

- (a) the Indian Civil Service;
- (b) the Indian Police Service;
- (c) the Indian Forest Service;
- (d) the Indian Educational Service;
- (e) the Indian Agricultural Service;
- (f) the Indian Service of Engineers;
- (g) the Imperial Branch of the Civil Veterinary Department;
- (h) officers of the Indian Medical Service in civil employ;
- (i) military or other officers holding posts other than listed posts borne on the provincial cadres of any of the above-mentioned services; and

(2) are not permanently employed under the Government of India, that is, officers who will not normally serve in future under a Provincial Government; and

(3) arrived in India for the first time after joining the service in question on a date antecedent to the 1st January, 1920, the Act of 1919 having become law a few days before this date.

3. All applications must reach the Local Government before the 31st March, 1924, by which date officers will have had ample opportunity to appreciate the effects of the recent constitutional changes and to arrive at a considered decision. Officers of the services specified who do not apply before that date will not be eligible for a pension on premature retirement in consequence of any constitutional developments which may subsequently take place. In the case of officers serving under the Government of Burma, where the reformed constitution is not yet in force, the period within which applications may be made will be extended beyond 31st March, 1924, to a date which will be announced hereafter. But no officer serving in Burma will be permitted to retire under the terms of this Resolution before reforms have actually been introduced in the province.

Every application must be accompanied by a certificate in the following form:—“I consider that the conditions of my service have been radically changed by the introduction of the reformed constitution and in consequence thereof I feel unable to serve the Government of India with advantage to the State. I therefore desire to be released from the obligations which I undertook in different circumstances.”

Applications when received by Local Governments will be forwarded with their recommendations to the Governor-General in Council, and will be transmitted by him to the Secretary of State, whose orders will be required before any officer is finally adjudged entitled to the new concessions.

The Secretary of State in Council reserves to himself the right to postpone the acceptance of resignations of officers until suitable arrangements can be made for their replacement. Officers who are not allowed for this reason to retire immediately will be permitted to retire as soon as the exigencies of the service to which they belong permit.

4. The compensation normally to be awarded to an officer who is allowed to retire prematurely will be such pension as is appropriate to the conditions and the period of his service. It would be improper, however, to burden Indian revenues with the payment of a pension to any officer who has not completed five years' total service and is, in view of his age, in a position probably to take up a new career in life, but in all services alike such officers will be eligible for a gratuity equal to the number of completed years of total service multiplied by their monthly pay at the date of their retirement. This gratuity will be converted into sterling at the rate of 1s. 9d. per rupee, the ordinary rate for the conversion into sterling of Indian pensions expressed in rupees.

The pension to be allowed to officers who have completed more than five years' total service will in all cases be based upon the number of completed years of active service and not of total service. Active service will, for this purpose, be interpreted in the same way as active service for the purpose of pension in Article 8 of the Civil Service Regulations, war leave being treated for this purpose as privilege leave. The pensions calculated on this basis which will be admissible to officers in the various services are indicated below. In all cases the letter N is used to denote the number of completed years of active service.

(A) *Indian Civil Service.*

The maximum pension of £1,000 is obtainable after 21 years' active service. The pension admissible will be $\pounds \frac{N}{21} \times 1,000$, subject to the maximum of £1,000 a year.

(B) *Officers to whom the ordinary Pension Rules in Part 4 of the Civil Service Regulations apply.*

(1) A maximum ordinary pension of Rs. 6,000 a year is obtainable after 30 years' service, of which four years may be spent on leave out of India, that is, the pension of Rs. 6,000 is obtainable after 26 years' active service. In addition, these officers may obtain additional pensions under Article 475A of the Civil Service Regulations, and for the purpose of the present scheme it is assumed that they will qualify for the maximum lower additional pension of Rs. 1,500 per annum, making a total of Rs. 7,500 per annum after 26 years' active service. The pension admissible will, therefore, be $\text{Rs. } \frac{N}{26} \times 7,500$ a year, subject to a maximum of Rs. 6,000 a year.

(2) Under the provisions of Articles 403 to 404A of the Civil Service Regulations, members of certain services are permitted

to add additional years to their actual qualifying service for superannuation pension, but not for any other classes of pension. Such officers will, however, be allowed to deduct the number of additional years which they may be entitled to reckon under the articles cited from the divisor 26.

(3) The pension will be converted into sterling at the rate of 1s. 9d. per rupee, the ordinary rate for the conversion into sterling of Indian pensions expressed in rupees.

(C) *Officers of the Indian Army in Civil Employ.*

Under the provisions of paragraph 305 of the Army Regulations (India), Volume II, an Indian army officer remains on the effective list of the army, and is eligible for reversion to military employment until he is placed on the supernumerary list on the expiration of 10 years from the date of his original transfer to civil employment. An officer who has not yet been so placed on the supernumerary list, and who desires to take advantage of the concessions set out in this Resolution, will first be given an opportunity to return to military employment, and he will not be eligible for any of them unless the army are unable or unwilling to absorb him. The ordinary maximum pension obtainable by an Indian army officer in civil employment is £800 a year. This pension is obtainable after approximately 30 years' total service, and for present purposes it may be assumed that of this period about five years might have been spent on furlough. The pension admissible to these officers will therefore be $\pounds \frac{N}{25} \times 800$, subject to a maximum of £800 a year.

(D) *Officers of the Indian Medical Service in Civil Employ.*

An officer of the Indian Medical Service who desires to take advantage of these rules will similarly be given first an opportunity to return to military employment, and will not be allowed any concession under this Resolution unless the army are unable or are unwilling to absorb him. Under the ordinary rules pensions are admissible to officers of the Indian Medical Service after 17 years' total service. Special provision is, therefore, required only for officers of less than 17 years' total service. The pension is £400 a year after 17 years' total service, of which three years may be assumed to have been spent on furlough, and the pension admissible to those officers will therefore be $\pounds \frac{N}{14} \times 400$, subject to a maximum of £400 a year.

5. *Gratuity.*—In addition to the gratuity or pension admissible to an officer under paragraph 4, a gratuity equal to the actual cost of first-class fares and passages from their last place of employment in India to their new home for the officer himself, and for his wife and children if in India, or, in the case of passages, free passages of the same number and class, will be granted to an officer in India at the time when he retires or goes on leave preparatory to retirement under these terms, if he actually proceeds to some other part of the British

Empire. No officer, however, will be entitled to receive any gratuity under this paragraph if he is entitled to the maximum pension specified for his service in paragraph 4.

The gratuity will be payable under the orders of the local government under whom the officer is serving when he actually retires or proceeds on leave preparatory to retirement, and after the Secretary of State has approved of his admission in due course to the benefits of this Resolution.

6. *Leave*.—An officer who desires to retire under the terms set out in this Resolution will ordinarily be allowed to take the full amount of leave admissible to him under the Regulations for the time being in force, subject to the condition that it shall expire on the 31st March, 1924.

After that date officers will normally only be allowed to take the privilege leave admissible to them. It will be, however, for the local government to grant leave which will extend after that date to an officer who has given notice of his intention to retire under these Rules before that date, if he has enjoyed no leave after the date of this Resolution and has, after the date of this Resolution, formally applied to Government for, and been refused, leave.

7. *Indian Civil Service Family Pensions*.—In order to secure suitable provision for the widows and orphans of members of the Indian Civil Service, contributions are compulsorily deducted from their salaries during their period of service, a *pro forma* account is maintained of the receipts and payments, and the contributions levied are so adjusted that the pensions provided by the Regulations shall not bring any charge on Indian revenues in excess of the amount specially sanctioned in aid of the pensions and for the cost of management. Members of this service who desire to retire under the terms of this Resolution will naturally desire to be informed of the family pension terms which will be admissible to them. These will be as follows, according to the alternative of the three permissible which the officer elects:—

(A) He may cease to make any contributions and payments under the Regulations, and he will retain only the right to a proportion of the contingent benefits under the Regulations for his wife and children existing on the date of retirement, and for any children subsequently born to that wife. This proportion shall be equal to the number of his completed years' total service divided by 25, and the calculation shall be based upon the pension admissible to the widow of an officer of the class to which he belonged at the time of his retirement.

(B) He may continue up to his 54th birthday (the age up to which an officer who resigns the service before becoming entitled to a pension under the ordinary rules is required to continue to subscribe, if permitted to do so at all) to make contributions under the Regulations at the rates payable by him at the date of retirement, and he will then retain the right to the full contingent benefits admissible, under the Regulations, according to his class on the date of his retirement, for his wife existing at

the date of retirement, and for any children by her, whether born before or after retirement. Under this alternative, subscriptions will be payable under the ordinary Regulations for each child, whether born before or after retirement. Further, the widow's pension under the Regulations varies with the class of an officer at his death, and in this case the right to the contingent widow's benefit retained will be limited to the scale applicable to her if her husband had died at the time of retirement.

(C) He may continue up to his 54th birthday to make contributions and payments under the Regulations at the rates which would have been payable by him from time to time had he remained in the service. In this case he will retain the full benefits admissible under the Regulations as if he had remained in the service until death or retirement with an ordinary pension.

The Secretary of State in Council will make good to the Indian Civil Service Family Pension Fund under a suitable procedure any loss which these concessions may be estimated to throw upon it.

8. A few minor points remain for settlement, e.g., the family pension terms which will be admissible to Indian army officers and the conditions upon which the commutation of pensions admissible under paragraph 9 will be allowed. The decisions on these points will be announced later.

II.

The Governor-General in Council has separately announced the special terms sanctioned by the Secretary of State in Council for officers retiring prematurely in consequence of the introduction of constitutional reforms. It is considered desirable to announce at the same time the under-mentioned general decisions of the Secretary of State in Council as to the right of officers to retire under ordinary Regulations.

Note 2, under Article 465A of the Civil Service Regulations, which was introduced with the new pension rules announced on the 15th November, 1919, reserved to the Government an absolute right to decline to permit an officer to retire before reaching the age of superannuation, should it be necessary in the public interest to retain his services. This note has, it is understood, led members of the services to fear that it may, in the future, be difficult to secure permission to retire before the age of superannuation. Indeed, certain officers, it is believed, have on this account refused to accept the new pension rules.

In order to allay this apprehension, it has been decided—

- (a) in the case of officers in service on the 15th November, 1919, to substitute for the rule in Note 2 under Article 465a of the Civil Service Regulations, a rule giving them the right to retire, subject to six months' notice; and
- (b) in the case of officers who have joined or who may join service after that date, to substitute for the rule in Note 2 a new rule corresponding

with the rule in Article 561 of the Civil Service Regulations (which has always been applicable to members of the Indian Civil Service), and permitting them to retire on pension under the ordinary rules when their resignations have been accepted.

Any officer who may have declined to elect to come under the provisions of the new pension rules, because of his objection to this note, may now elect in writing, before the 31st March, 1922, to do so. This option applies also to any person who may have retired already, after the announcement of the new pension terms in November, 1919.

Tuesday, 8th November, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

MARRIED OFFICERS.

1. Sir J. D. REES asked the Secretary of State for India whether he has any further information to give the House regarding the position of the married officer in the Indian Army, and the recognition of brevet rank, so far as pension is concerned?

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Montagu): As regards the first part of the question, I am not in a position to add anything to the answer I gave to the hon. and gallant Member for Devizes on the 22nd July last, of which I will send my hon. Friend a copy. The question of the recognition of brevet rank for pension purposes should be addressed to the Secretary of State for War, the rules for the Indian Army following those for the British Army in this respect.

Colonel Sir C. YATE: Is the status of the married officer in India now receiving consideration, or has the question been shelved?

Mr. MONTAGU: I would rather that my hon. and gallant Friend gave me notice. My impression is that a promise was given that the question would be considered when a permanent scale was being arranged. Perhaps my hon. and gallant Friend will give me notice, or I will write him on the subject.

PRESS LEGISLATION.

2. Sir J. D. REES asked the Secretary of State for India whether he can now

state what action the Government of India have taken upon the Report of the Press Legislation Committee?

Mr. MONTAGU: A Bill based upon the Committee's recommendation was introduced in the Legislative Assembly on the 15th September.

AMRITSAR SHOOTING.

3. Sir J. D. REES asked the Secretary of State for India whether the assessors appointed in that behalf have dealt with the claims put forward on behalf of those who lost their lives at Jallianwallah Bagh; and, if so, with what general results?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am informed that the Committee has not yet concluded its inquiry.

TRADE UNIONS.

4. Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether, considering that many of the so-called trade unions in India are stated to be little more than strike committees, and in view of the acts of violence and intimidation which have characterised a large proportion of the disputes in which these committees have been concerned, it is the intention of the Government of India to proceed with legislation for the purpose of giving legal status to trade unions in India, and to define the law of agency in such a way that no act could be made the ground of a claim on trade union funds unless it was definitely proved that the governing body had sanctioned the act; and whether, having regard to the difficulty of obtaining definite proof in a country like India, and to the fact that the majority of these loose organisations publish no accounts and assign no functions to their governing body, he will consider the question of the unfairness to the rest of the community of either legalising picketing or of putting these so-called trade unions outside the law?

Mr. MONTAGU: The Government of India are considering the lines on which legislation should be undertaken for the registration and protection of trade unions and are consulting local governments with a view to submitting proposals. Pending receipt of actual proposals for legislation I feel it would be premature to discuss the tentative conclusions on which the Government of India are consulting local governments.

Colonel WEDGWOOD: Is the question justified in saying that many of these trade unions are little more than "strike committees"?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am not responsible for the wording of the question.

SEDITIONOUS LEAFLETS (INDIAN ARMY).

6. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India what steps have been taken to put a stop to the circulation of leaflets in India tampering with the loyalty of the Indian Army; how many of the authors and printers of these leaflets have been prosecuted and with what result; and whether any of those who signed these leaflets have been allowed to go free?

Mr. MONTAGU: This matter has engaged the close attention of the Government of India and local governments. I understand that the only leaflet of this nature that has come to notice has been proscribed under Section 12 of the Press Act. There were no signatures on the leaflet, though a few names were mentioned in it out of a very large number who are reported to have signed the "fatwa," extracts of which the leaflet purported to reproduce. The Press at Delhi, which printed the leaflet, has been ordered to give security, but has failed to do so, and has ceased working.

COLONEL AITKEN.

7. **Lieut.-Colonel CROFT** asked the Secretary of State for India if he can now state what form of recompense it has been decided to give to Colonel Aitken, whose conduct in East Africa was vindicated a year ago and who for several years has suffered owing to his not being employed?

Mr. MONTAGU: Colonel Aitken is being permitted to retire with effect from 26th May, 1918, namely, the date on which he attained the age of 57, on the maximum pension of his rank, and is being granted the honorary rank of Brigadier-General on retirement.

RAILWAYS AND TRANSPORT SERVICE.

9. **Major GLYN** asked the Secretary of State for India what action, if any, is being taken by his Department or the Government of India to hasten orders for machinery, materials, etc. required for railway and transport service in India of

a nature which at present cannot be manufactured in India now that the value of the rupee has more or less stabilised; and whether there are considerable arrears of orders usually placed in this country, due to unstable currency values, during the past two years?

Mr. MONTAGU: It is the case that, owing to unfavourable financial conditions of which exchange is only one factor, it has been found necessary in recent years to restrict railway expenditure to a lower amount than might otherwise have been deemed desirable, but orders have been, and are being, placed for machinery, etc. up to the limits of the funds allotted for expenditure on the services concerned.

Major GLYN: Can the right hon. Gentleman do anything to encourage orders from India in order to give work to men who are unemployed in this country?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am very anxious to do everything in my power to develop the resources of India. If some arrangement of mutual advantage to both countries can be devised I shall be only too delighted to do everything in my power to facilitate it.

Major GLYN: Will the right hon. Gentleman receive a deputation of workers?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am always at my hon. and gallant Friend's disposal.

10. **Major GLYN** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is in a position to make any statement as to the policy of the Government or of the Government of India which will give effect to some of the proposals contained in the Report of the Committee set up to inquire into the position of Indian railways; whether any limit of time has been put to the period of consideration by the Government of India in view of the urgency of some of the recommendations?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am not yet in a position to make a statement as to the policy arising out of the recommendations of the Indian Railway Committee. I have asked the Government of India for their general views on the Report, and it will be necessary to take the opinion of the Indian Legislature. I do not think it would be reasonable to impose any definite time limit for consideration; but I can assure my hon. and

gallant Friend that I have been, and am now, in constant telegraphic communication with the Government of India on the more urgent matters reported on by the Committee with a view to action as soon as possible.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING.

11. **Major GLYN** asked the Secretary of State for India how much money is each year spent by the Government of India and by the Provincial Governments upon printing; whether, if the habit of having each and every memorandum, minute, order, telegram, or other document printed was reduced, not only would a considerable financial saving be effected, but the secrecy and confidential character of official documents might be proportionately respected; whether a committee has been inquiring into the organisation and system of Government Departments in India; and whether this matter may be specially considered?

Mr. MONTAGU: The recent Government of India Secretariat Procedure Committee, while recognising that Indian conditions necessitate official printing on a larger scale than in England, made certain recommendations for economy, which the Government of India have endorsed. Special steps are taken to secure secrecy for confidential documents. The total expenditure on Government presses in India in the current estimates is roughly 75 lakhs, this figure including cost of staff, material, and stores. I would point out that the estimates of the Government of India and the several Provinces are now subjected to close scrutiny by the respective legislatures.

Major GLYN: Is the right hon. Gentleman not aware that no documents printed in India can be regarded as absolutely secret and that the only way in which documents can be kept secret is by having them type written?

Mr. MONTAGU: No. I am surprised to hear that.

AGITATORS (BIRTHPLACES).

12. **Sir C. YATE** asked the Secretary of State for India whether Mohammed Ali and Shaukat Ali and the four others who it is reported have been convicted and sentenced to two years' rigorous imprisonment are by birth subjects of British

India or of native states; if the latter, of what states; and what is the birthplace and parentage of Mr. Gandhi?

Mr. MONTAGU: Mohammed Ali and Shaukat Ali are by birth subjects of the State of Rampur in the United Provinces. All the other accused are described as residents of places in British India. Mr. Gandhi's father was the Diwan of the State of Porebandar in Kathiawar.

Sir W. DAVISON: Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the advisability of deporting Gandhi to his native State, to see whether that native State can deal with him?

Mr. SPEAKER: That does not arise out of the question.

MOPLAH REBELLION.

13. **Captain Viscount CURZON** asked the Secretary of State for India whether the situation in Malabar shows as yet any sign of improvement or otherwise?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have not for some days past received any general review of the position. On the 27th October the Government of India reported that the General Officer Commanding the Madras District was satisfied with the situation, but needed more troops, which were being sent, in order to bring the operations to a close as soon as possible. The last received reports cover the four last days of October, and indicate that the troops and police are actively engaged in locating and capturing the rebels, who are still offering resistance, whenever they are met. In view of the difficulty of the country and the absence of communications, it is obvious that the complete pacification of the district must take time.

Viscount CURZON: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the communiqué issued by the district magistrate on the 4th of November stated that a refugee, with ghastly wounds in the neck, had seen 50 Hindus beheaded and their bodies thrown into a well? Has he no information about this?

Mr. MONTAGU: I think that it would be more courteous if the Noble Lord had given me notice of a question of detail of that kind. I have stated to the House over and over again that there have been the most shocking atrocities committed by these rebels on loyal Hindu fellow subjects.

Viscount CURZON: Is not the right hon. Gentleman aware of all the communiqués which are published in the Press, which are issued by the district magistrate? Do not all these things come to his notice in the ordinary course?

Mr. MONTAGU: To the best of my recollection every official telegram containing news on the subject of Malabar received in my office has been published, whether they are communications which have been issued in India or are reported by Reuter by the ordinary cable. There have been several telegrams from both sources reporting atrocities by the Moplahs. I cannot say offhand whether I have seen that particular telegram or whether it was an official communiqué.

Viscount CURZON: Is not the right hon. Gentleman's information six days old?

Mr. MONTAGU: No.

Lieut.-Colonel CROFT: In view of the violence of these crimes, will the right hon. Gentleman consider the advisability, according to precedent, of offering the Moplahs Dominion Home Rule?

EX-SERVICE MEN.

INDIA OFFICE (LEGAL ADVICES DEPARTMENT).

8. **Captain LOSEBY** asked the Secretary of State for India if a Mr. H. A. Painter, a non-service man, was engaged by the India Office Legal Advices Department in September last at a salary of £200, rising to £250 per annum; if at the time of his engagement by the India Office he was in other employment; why no notification of the vacancy was posted on the staff side notice board in accordance with the promise given at the Departmental Whitley Council, and in consequence no member of the staff knew of, or had the opportunity of applying for, the vacancy; if he is aware of the fact that suitable unemployed candidates are available from ex-service men's associations; and what action he purposes taking in this matter?

Mr. MONTAGU: I would refer the hon. and gallant Member to the reply given to the hon. Member for Chelsea on 2nd November. I believe it is the case that Mr. Painter was in employment up to the date of his appointment to the India

Office. The arrangement for notifying vacancies was meant for posts tenable by persons already members of the India Office Establishment, but the special object of this appointment was to obtain a man with outside experience of a special kind. I do not know what action the hon. and gallant Member contemplates.

Mr. RAPER: Will the right hon. Gentleman receive a deputation on the subject?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am particularly anxious, in making appointments in my Department, to consider the claims of ex-service men. If there is any feeling that anything prejudicial to their interest has been done I shall be glad to receive a deputation.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

KARACHI AERODROME (DETENTION ALLOWANCE).

Mr. H. JONES asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the claims of Flying-officer W. H. B. Handsford, and the late Flying-officer Robert Pughe, for detention allowance while they were on special duty at Karachi superintending the construction of the aerodrome; whether it has been decided that the claims are not admissible under India Army Rules, notwithstanding the fact that Major-General F. J. Fowler, Commanding Karachi Brigade, in a letter dated 20th April, 1920, stated that the action taken was, in his opinion, the one most suitable; and whether he will give further consideration to the claims with a view of recommending them for exceptional treatment?

Mr. MONTAGU: The claims of Flying-officers Handsford and Pughe to detention allowance were recommended by the Brigade Commander at Karachi, but the Air Officer Commanding in India held that the circumstances of the detention of these officers were not in any way so exceptional as to warrant the admission of their claims, and the Government of India, who have been consulted, support his view. I regret, therefore, that I am unable to intervene.

FINANCE.

Sir J. D. REES asked the Secretary of State for India whether any authoritative statement exists showing the incidence of taxation, amount of public debt, and possession of productive assets by the Government of India; and, if so, whether such can be made available for Members of Parliament?

Mr. MONTAGU: Such information as is available relating to the points mentioned by my hon. Friend will be found on page 16 of the Explanatory Memorandum for 1921-22, of which I am sending him a copy.

Wednesday, 9th November, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA (LAW AND ORDER).

56. **Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS** asked the Lord Privy Seal whether he has now considered the Motion standing on the Paper in the names of the hon. Member for Twickenham and others; and if he can give a day for its discussion—

"That this House views with grave concern the present state of India, and urges upon His Majesty's Government to take immediate steps to re-establish law and order in that country."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: Yes, Sir. As I said on Monday last, we have carefully considered the Motion, but it is not possible for me to find a day for the Motion within the limits of the present sittings of the House, and I am bound to say that in the opinion of His Majesty's Government the present moment is not opportune for such a discussion. I understand there is general agreement to bring the business of the House to a close not later than seven o'clock to-morrow evening. [HON. MEMBERS: "No!"] I have been led to understand that there is general agreement as to the proposal of the Government to bring our business to an end by then. [HON. MEMBERS: "No, no!", and "There is to be another Session of this House!"] I should perhaps add that, even if there were time, in the opinion of His Majesty's Government,

the moment is not opportune for such a discussion.

Sir W. JOYNSON-HICKS: May I ask my right hon. Friend if he is aware—I am sure he is—of the very grave anxiety felt by many Members of this House in regard to this matter, as there has been no Debate on Indian affairs this year, and will he give us an undertaking that the Indian Vote, the salary of the Secretary for India shall be set down as early as possible next Session so that we may have an early Debate?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: Yes, Sir. Of course I am reluctant to give such an undertaking in regard to the programme of a Session of Parliament which has not begun. I recognise, however, the full force of what my right hon. Friend has said. Since the salary of the Secretary for India was placed upon the Votes of the House in order that the House might discuss the matter, the House has had no opportunity so to do. I think, however, my hon. Friend has made out a good case for putting the Vote down at an early date, so that the earliest possible opportunity may be given next Session.

Lieut.-Colonel ARCHER-SHEE: Can the right hon. Gentleman say why this House is never allowed to discuss a question of vast importance like this, whereas in past years the House of Commons has always been given the opportunity of discussing Indian affairs, and especially when there has been a grave state of unrest?

WRITTEN ANSWERS.
INDIA.

CENTRAL PROVINCES (COMMISSIONERS OF DIVISIONS).

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Legislative Council of the Central Provinces has passed a Resolution to abolish the appointments of Commissioners of Divisions; and, if so, what action is being taken by the Government of India in the matter?

Mr. MONTAGU: The answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. I have not yet received any official communication on the subject from the local Government or the Government of India and no action could be taken in

the sense indicated in the Resolution without the sanction of the Secretary of State in Council.

CINEMATOGRAPH FILMS (CENSORSHIP).

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India what has been the result of the establishment of censorship of cinema films in India, who are the censors, and what have they done?

Mr. MONTAGU: I understand that boards for the censorship of films are at work in Calcutta, Bombay, Madras and Rangoon. They are appointed by the local Governments concerned. I have not received any reports as to their work. But I understand that the Government of India has recently had its attention drawn to the matter, and suggestions have been made to it for making the censorship in each place more efficient.

ARMY OFFICERS (PENSIONS).

Mr. GWYNNE asked the Secretary of State for India why officers of the Indian Army who were due to retire but were retained for the duration of the War were not allowed to draw pension in addition to their pay and allowances for this period, whilst British officers were; and whether he can see his way to apply Army Order 364, of 1920, to officers in the Indian Army to equalise their position?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am in communication with the Government of India as to whether there are sufficient grounds for granting to officers of the Indian Army a concession similar to that granted to British service officers by Army Order No. 364 of 1920.

WAZIR FORCE, JANDOLA (HUTS).

Sir M. DOCKRELL asked the Secretary of State for War if, in connection with the recent fighting on the North-West Frontier of India, he is aware that a battalion of an Indian regiment, partly British officered and forming portion of the Wazir force on active service at Jandola, in the heart of the Mashud country, was during the abnormal heat there in the month of July, 1921, promised, as a protection from the sun, Afghan huts which had been lying at Lahore since 1919; that the huts were brought in sections to Jandola; that headquarters at Simla issued an order that the Wazir force must pay for these huts, and

as the latter force had not the necessary funds to pay for them the battalion was not allowed to erect them, and the huts lay in sections at Jandola throughout the hot season; that an order was subsequently issued from Simla that pith helmets were to be worn by the troops in the tents; that there was at the time a cholera epidemic raging at Jandola which resulted in many deaths among the troops of the battalion; and whether any inquiry has been, or will be, made into this matter?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have no information on the subject, but will inquire from the Government of India.

GOVERNMENT SERVANTS (GANDHI CAPS).

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether Government servants in India have been wearing Gandhi caps, and thus openly showing their participation in the disloyal non-co-operation movement that has been permitted to manifest itself; and, if so, whether steps have been taken to dismiss all such men from Government employ and to instal loyal men in their place, or what has been done in the matter?

Mr. MONTAGU: I am informed that in Bombay the use of the caps has spread to Government and other offices, this being ascribed in part to the attraction of a novelty and to some extent to intimidation. I observe also from the Press that the Government of the Central Provinces has issued orders that Government servants are not to wear the caps and that this order has been approved by the local Legislative Council. Similar orders appear to have been issued in some Government offices in Bombay.

LAHORE MUNICIPAL FIRE BRIGADE (MR. NEWLAND).

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether Mr. Newland, an ex-soldier and the superintendent of the Lahore Municipal Fire Brigade, was ordered by the Municipal Committee of Lahore to wear khaddar uniform, that is uniform made of Gandhi's homespun cloth, the badge of disloyalty to the British Government, and was compelled to resign his appointment in consequence; and, if so, what steps have been taken by the Government of India in the matter and what provision has been made for Mr. Newland?

Mr. MONTAGU: The answer to the first part of the question is that Mr. Newland, with the rest of the municipal staff, was ordered to wear a uniform of Indian made khaki homespun. On the resolution being passed, Mr. Newland tendered his resignation, stating that it was impossible for him to accept the order. His resignation was supplemented by a general complaint of the Committee's neglect of the fire brigade and the inadequacy of his pay. His resignation was accepted. The Government of India understand that Mr. Newland has been re-employed elsewhere on the recommendation of the Deputy-Commissioner of the Lahore district.

Thursday, 10th November, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

PUNJAB REBELLION, 1919 (TREATMENT OF OFFICERS).

33. Sir C. YATE asked the Prime Minister if the attention of the Government has been drawn to the letter of Sir Michael O'Dwyer, in the Press on the 7th instant, exposing the unfair treatment of officers, civil and military, who took an active part in suppressing the Punjab rebellion of 1919; and, in view of the additional facts brought out in that letter, if he can state what steps the Government intend to take to safeguard the future prospects and to prevent the further persecution of those officers, British and Indian, who have been and are so seriously affected by the orders issued, as shown on page 50 of the Government's Review of India in 1920?

The PRIME MINISTER: I am sorry that I am not in a position to answer this question. I have not had time to go into it. I will circulate an answer in the course of the next 24 hours.

Sir C. YATE: Will the right hon. Gentleman also look into the case of the High Court judge who was compelled to retire because he did not feel able to meet the man he had sentenced to transportation for life as a Minister of the Province?

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

CIVIL SERVANTS, CENTRAL PROVINCES (PAY).

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India what action has been taken by the Government of India in the case of the refusal by the Legislative Council of the Central Provinces to pass the sum of Rs. 65,000 sanctioned to cover the cost of a higher rate of pay for provincial service officers promoted to hold Indian Civil Service posts?

Mr. MONTAGU: The action taken with reference to reduced or refused Budget grants in a province rests, under the Act, with the Governor and the local Government and not with the Government of India. I have not yet heard whether the Governor of the Central Provinces has "certified" the grant in question under Section 72 D (2) of the Act.

MOPLAH REBELLION.

Sir J. D. REES asked the Secretary of State for India whether he has information to impart to the House regarding the extent to which forcible conversion of Hindus by the Moplahs in Malabar has prevailed; and whether the Indian Caliphate agitation leaders have denounced these excesses on the part of their co-religionists?

Mr. MONTAGU: In consequence of the questions asked last week, I telegraphed to the Government of India inquiring whether they could furnish a statement, but there has not been time for a reply. I shall be glad to inform my hon. Friend when I receive the answer.

SURPLUS ARMY OFFICERS.

Sir C. YATE asked the Secretary of State for India whether it is now possible for him to announce the terms to be given to surplus Indian Army officers; and how far these terms compare favourably with the terms given to surplus British cavalry officers in Army Order 320 of July last and the terms offered to naval officers in Admiralty Order 1056 of 1920?

Mr. MONTAGU: No, Sir. I am afraid it will be some weeks before I can announce the terms, but I think I can

promise that they will compare favourably with the terms given to surplus British cavalry officers and naval officers.

PUNJAB DISTURBANCES, 1919.

Sir J. D. REES asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Government of India has disposed of the cases of the 86 persons sentenced to imprisonment for participation in the Punjab disturbances of 1919, which it is understood have come under the subsequent revision of the Viceroy himself?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have not yet heard.

BRITISH SERVICE OFFICERS (PAY).

Major BOYD-CARPENTER asked the Secretary of State for India whether the rate of pay given to a regimental major with five years' service in that rank in a British regiment serving in India amounts after deduction of Indian Income Tax to approximately £524 per annum, whereas the pay and emoluments of an officer of similar rank and similar service at home amounts to £839 after deduction of Income Tax or, if a soldier servant is not provided, to £875 per annum; whether, as the value of the rupee shows no sign of rising to the rate of 2s., on which basis the pay of British officers serving in India was based, this anomaly will now be rectified; and if he is aware that such apparent injustice leads to discontent, in view of the acknowledged fact that a higher rate of pay should be given to officers serving in a hot climate away from their home than to those at home and who are not therefore serving under such disadvantages?

Mr. MONTAGU: Assuming that the officer be married and without children,

the figures given are approximately correct if the exchange value of the rupee is taken as 1s. 4½d. The present rupee rates of pay for British service officers in India were not determined by an assumption that the rupee would remain at 2s. The question of the emoluments of these officers and the effect thereon of variations in exchange is engaging the attention of the Government of India; at present they are not prepared to grant any increase of pay.

FISCAL COMMISSION.

Mr. WADDINGTON asked the Secretary of State for India whether copies of the list of questions recently issued by the Indian Fiscal Commission are available at the India Office; and whether representative organisations and individuals in the United Kingdom having trade interests in India will be allowed to present, as evidence receivable by the Commission, written answers to the questions?

Mr. MONTAGU: Copies of the list of questions have not so far been forwarded to the India Office, but I have seen a list published in an Indian newspaper of which I will send my hon. Friend a copy. The question of procedure is of course one for the consideration of the Commission. The Commission has announced that associations or individuals wishing to represent their views should apply to the Secretary, Indian Fiscal Commission, Simla. If my hon. Friend would like any assistance in the way of forwarding communications to the Commission I will gladly see what can be done.

INDIAN DEBATES.

Volume of Second Session of 1921

(15th December to 19th December).

Thursday, 15th December, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

INDIA.

POLITICAL LEADERS (ARRESTS).

Colonel WEDGWOOD (*by Private Notice*) asked the Secretary of State for India whether Motilal Nehru, Lajput Rai, C. R. Das, and some hundred other Indian political leaders have been arrested, what sentences they have received, whether they are being treated as political prisoners or as common criminals, and whether, as it is the policy of His Majesty's Government to extend to India gradually self-governing institutions, he has taken any steps to secure that politicians whose help we may require in such self-government, are treated with no indignity?

The **SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA** (Mr. Montagu): I am expecting to receive at any moment a telegram from the Government of India about the prison treatment of political prisoners. I will then communicate with my hon. and gallant Friend.

MOPLAH REBELLION.

Sir J. D. REES (*by Private Notice*) asked the Secretary of State for India whether he has any information to give before the House rises on the situation in Malabar?

Mr. MONTAGU: The White Paper issued yesterday contains all the information received up to 6th December. I have received since that date nine other telegrams which are for the most part detailed military reports of operations. They show continued progress in capturing rebels and reducing the area affected. I will circulate in the OFFICIAL REPORT the summary for the week ending 12th December, with other details.

Lieut.-Colonel ARCHER-SHEE: Can the right hon. Gentleman give the House any information as to the situation in Calcutta?

Mr. MONTAGU: I have brought down no further information beyond that which has appeared in the Press.

Colonel Sir C. YATE: Have all the agitators now been arrested, and are they to be tried or interned?

Mr. W. THORNE: Shot!

Mr. MONTAGU: I cannot give an answer as to every agitation in India. I think in every case in Calcutta agitators who have been arrested for breaches of the law are being, or have been, tried in the Courts.

Mr. W. THORNE: Will the right hon. Gentleman give the House the definition of an agitator?

Mr. SPEAKER: That would take much longer time than we can spare at present.

Sir J. D. REES: Will Mr. Knapps' report, when received, be made available to Members of this House?

Mr. MONTAGU: I think so. It is a public inquiry; I think the report will be public.

The following is the Summary referred to:

Kachins, Gurkhas, and Special Police have all had successful encounters with rebels during last few days, and have killed about 200, besides taking some prisoners and a number of weapons including firearms. In Suffolks' engagement, enemy attacked in desperate fashion and 31 were killed; principal leaders, with diminishing number of followers, still remain to be dealt with, but their position is becoming desperate, and there are increasing signs that rebellion collapsing so far at least as active resistance concerned. Fighting gangs penned into hills behind Mannarghat road. From Kalikava to Nilambur road, from Nilambur to Edakkara and south-east of Calicut Taluk surrenders continue, and though number of arms handed in not very great, there can be no doubt that moral effect considerable. In another message it is stated that the military authorities are agreed that if existing units are kept fully up to strength, for which arrangements have been made, the number of troops now on the spot is sufficient to deal with those rebels who are still defiant, to prevent the rebellion spreading, and to enable the peaceful element of the population to reassert themselves. Other messages report that the total Moplah casualties up to the 9th December included 1,826 killed and 1,500 wounded. 5,474 have been

captured and voluntary surrenders are 14,241. There are also other applications to surrender which are being dealt with in turn. The figures include surrenders by persons of every degree of complicity from passive sympathy to active fighting, but the gang leaders and gangs, as such, have not yet surrendered.

Friday, 16th December, 1921.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

OPIUM TRADE, INDIA.

25. **Mr. GILBERT** asked the Secretary of State for India what is the acreage in India now under cultivation with the opium poppy; how many chests of Indian opium are now exported annually; what are the destinations of this exported opium; and whether any and, if any, how much is converted into prepared opium for smoking?

Colonel GIBBS (Treasurer of the Household): The total area under poppy cultivation in British India amounted to 156,435 acres in the year 1919-20. 9,823 chests of opium were exported in that year. The countries which imported this opium were the Straits Settlements, Dutch East Indies, Siam, French Indo-China, Japan, United Kingdom, Hong Kong, British North Borneo, Ceylon, Mauritius and the Fiji Islands. My right hon. Friend is not in a position to state how much of the raw opium exported from India to other countries is there converted into prepared opium for smoking.

Mr. BARNES: Can the hon. and gallant Gentleman say if the Government are working in full harmony with the organisation under the League of Nations for the reduction or suppression of this trade?

Colonel GIBBS: I am not in a position to state that myself, but I will tell my right hon. Friend what the right hon. Gentleman says.

Mr. BARNES: Will the hon. and gallant Gentleman make inquiries on the matter?

Colonel GIBBS: Yes, Sir.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

BOYCOTTING, BURMA.

Colonel WEDGWOOD asked the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the political leaders in Burma have been arrested and imprisoned under the Indian Defence of the Realm Act instead of, as elsewhere in India, under the ordinary laws; and, if so, why was such extraordinary action taken?

Mr. MONTAGU: The means of meeting a systematic boycott of loyal people affected by the ordinary law in India is to proclaim as unlawful the associations which are responsible. I understand that in Burma the boycotting of loyal Burmese is the work of individual extremists who belong to a perfectly respectable association, which it would be unjust to proclaim. Special legislation is being prepared, but in the meantime the Lieutenant-Governor has, as an emergency measure, temporarily interned a few mischief-makers under the Defence of India Act.

Monday, 19th December, 1921.

WRITTEN ANSWERS.

INDIA.

EGRETS.

Mr. KILEY asked the Secretary of State for India whether he has yet obtained information as to the extent to which egrets are farmed in India about which he stated on 28th April last that he was making inquiries; and, if so, what is the result of his inquiries?

Mr. MONTAGU: I suggested to the Indian authorities the desirability of a thorough inquiry into this matter, the present evidence on which is somewhat conflicting, but the financial stringency has made that impossible at present.

CIVIL DISTURBANCES (PREVENTIVE MEASURES).

Mr. SPOOR asked the Secretary of State for India whether he has had any information from the Indian Government which would indicate that in their con-

sidered opinion those methods of repression, which failed so lamentably in Ireland, and which had consequently to be abandoned, are the only methods by which the situation in India can be met?

Mr. MONTAGU: I find it difficult to understand what my hon. Friend has in

mind. There is nothing in India which should be described as repression. Action has been taken to prevent civil disturbances and to put a stop to breaches of public order, in nearly every case by means of prosecution for offences against the ordinary law.

INDEX

17 FEBRUARY—19 DECEMBER, 1921.

EXPLANATION OF ARRANGEMENT AND ABBREVIATIONS.

Bills: Read First, Second, or Third Time = 1R., 2R., 3R. *Amendt.* = Amendment. *Com.* = Committee. *Con.* = Consideration. *Rep.* = Report. *Sug.* = Suggestions.

Where in the Index * is added with Reading of a Bill, or a Vote in Committee of Supply, it indicates that no Debate took place on that stage of the Bill, or on that Vote.

Subjects discussed in Committee of Supply are entered under their headings, and also under Members' Names, without reference to the actual Vote before the Committee.

Aden

Colonial Office to Administer, 44.
Traders' Views on Transfer of Administration to Colonial Office, 250.

Administration

Imperial Parliament's Right to Interfere, 22, 28.

Afghanistan

Bolshevik Positions in, 300.
Continued Tribal Risings, 173.
Negotiations in Progress at Kabul, 97, 144.
Subsidy Payable to Amir, 115.
Tribal Risings in 1919—Number of Troops Employed, 164.

Aitken, Colonel

Compensation for Removal from Command, 132, 306, 319.

Ali Brothers

Apology and Undertaking Given Regarding Seditious Speeches, 216.
Birthplace of, 321.
Mohammed Ali, Speeches by, 122, 136.
Speeches at Bombay Bonfire of British Cloth Alleged, 268.

Aligarh

Disturbances at, 233.

Allahabad

Acquisition of Bungalow in New Cantonment, 235.
University Examiners' Adverse Report on Quality of Work, 121.

Amery, Mr. L. C. M. S.—*Parliamentary Secretary to the Admiralty*

British North Borneo Company—Publication of Correspondence Requested, 4.
Overseas Settlement—Officers and Men of Indian Army Ineligible for Grant of Passages, 133.

Amritsar

Sikh Regiment Insubordination Denied, 117.

Andamans

Prison System Report Publication, 89.

Archer-Shee, Lieut.-Colonel M.

Administration — Imperial Parliament's Right to Interfere, 32.

Archer-Shee, Lieut.-Colonel M.—*cont.*

Army Strength Reduction Return Requested, 266.
Government of Burma Bill, Government Decision not to Proceed with, 275.
Moplah Rebellion—Position of Affairs, 337.
Preservation of Order—Notice of Motion in House of Commons, 326.

Armitage, Mr. R.

Monasite Sand—British Control of Supply, 229.

Army

Allowances Increased, 50.
Auditing of Accounts, 163.
Badges and Shoulder Titles Alterations, 151.
Bands Upkeep Arrangements, 45, 178.
Cadets

Entering from Sandhurst, 87.
1916 Candidates, Future of, 157.
Selection for Indian Army Voluntary, 189.

Cavalry

Allotment of Duties for Internal Security, 276.
Comparative Strengths in European Countries, 157.
Disbandment, 10, 138, 159, 208, 284, 294, 330.

Chargers

Hardships Entailed upon Officers Compelled to Purchase, 255.
Purchase at Concessional Rates, 89.
Codrington, K. de B., Case, 146.
Cost of British and Indian Soldier per annum, 122.
Differentiation between Married and Single Officers, 245.
Disbandment

Cavalry

Officers' Future, 208, 284, 294, 330.
Reductions, 10, 138, 159.
80th Carnatic Infantry, Case of, 217.
List of Units Concerned, 111.
Particulars of, 101.
Pre-War Infantry Battalions, 148, 224, 280.
Proceeding in Spite of Undertaking to the Contrary, 118, 126, 236, 256.
Esher Committee's Recommendations, 13, 33, 37, 96, 197.
Field Service Batt. for Afghanistan and Waziristan Operations, 291.
Housing of Officers, 32.

17 Feb.—19 Dec., 1921.

Army—cont.

- King's India Cadets to Enter Indian Army, 32.
 Language Examinations
 Alleged Increased Difficulty of, 278.
 Tuition Difficulties of Officers on Active Service, 297.
 Leave Pay—Callaghan Case, 214.
 Machine Gun Corps Incorporated in Cavalry and Infantry Units, 113.
 Marriage Allowance Not to be Given to British Officers, 147, 317.
 Medical Expenses—A. E. Brown Case, 57.
 Medical Service
 Appeal Rights, 133.
 British - Born Officers—Number and Position of, 142.
 English Leave Delayed through War Conditions, 211.
 Pay Increase Ante-dating, 116.
 Promotion, 18.
 Travelling Facilities, 69.
 Mess Dress, Wearing of, 242.
 Military Accounts Department to be Re-organised, 44.
 Overseas Service of Native Regiments, 116.
 Pay
 Concessions to Officers Studying in Japan, 185, 277.
 Delay in Payments to Officers Returning to India from Overseas, 110.
 Effect of Exchange Rate on, 91, 107, 111, 331.
 Increases, 10, 50, 237.
 Royal Engineers Officers' Rates, 177.
 Pensions
 Brevet Rank and, 317.
 Dyer, General, 156.
 Johnson, Colonel F., 156.
 Re-assessment for Officers who Held High Civil Appointments, 9, 111, 171, 221, 244, 285.
 Retirement Delayed owing to War, 132, 164, 230, 302, 327.
 Wife an Innocent Party in Divorce Suit, Position of, 171.
 Withheld for Grave Misconduct—Hennessy Case, 172.
 Proportion of European and Native Troops, 127.
 Re-Organisation
 Committee Considering, 92, 167.
 Proposals, 83.
 Reserve of Officers
 Civil Servants Refused Concessions, 168.
 Decoration for, 2, 46.
 Service Outside India, 51.
 Silladar Cavalry Regiments' Disbandment, 152.
 Strength Reduction
 Allotment of Cavalry to Provinces, 256.
 Basis of, 182.
 Enquiries by Imperial Defence Committee, 241.
 New Establishment, Statistics, 183.
 Number of Units Not under Disbandment Orders, 269.
 Personnel of Committee Deciding Constitution, 184.
 Position Regarding Continued Tribal Risings, 173.
 Proposals, 11, 52, 96.
 Return Requested, 266.

Army—cont.

- Strength Reduction—*cont.*
 White Paper Publication Requested, 276.
 Travelling Concessions to Officers, 45, 64.
Ashley, Lieut.-Colonel W. W.
 Bengal—Munitions Department Fraud Case, 270.
Assam Coolies' Exodus
 Cessation, 251.
 Communiqués, 199.
 Position of Affairs, 203.
 Unrest, 166.
Auxiliary Force Act
 Compulsory Methods of Recruitment, 172.
 Recruiting
 Progress, 148, 159.
 Statistics, 13, 309.
Baldwin, Rt. Hon. S.—President of the Board of Trade
 Waziristan—Position of Affairs, 229.
Banbury, Rt. Hon. Sir F. G.
 Indian Divorces (Validity) Bill. *Com.* 210.
Barnes, Rt. Hon. G. N.
 Opium Trade Statistics, 339.
Barnston, Major H.—Controller of the Household
 Auxiliary Force Act—Recruiting Statistics, 309.
 Basante Kumar Roy, Sinn Fein Emissary to India, 309.
 Bhagalpur—Criticism of Prosecution Administration (Grant Case), 310.
 Islamic Deputation Cost, Credentials, and Selection of Mr. Kidwai, 216.
 Sedition—Speeches Delivered by Ali Brothers—Apology and Undertaking Made, 216.
Barton, Sir W.
 Cotton Mills—Capital, Profits, and Taxation Statistics, 70.
Basante Kumar Roy
 Sinn Fein Emissary to India, 309.
Behar and Orissa
 Village Industries Scheme Promoted, 297.
 Village Self-Government Proposals, 176.
Bell, Mr. J.
 "Nyanma Taingkyo Thadinsa"—Publication by Government, 86.
Bell, Lieut.-Colonel W. C. H.
 British Army—Marriage Allowance not to be Issued, 239.
Bellairs, Commander C. W.
 Army
 Cost of British and Indian Soldier per annum, 122.

17 Feb.—19 Dec., 1921.

Bellairs, Commander C. W.—cont.Army—*cont.*

Language Examinations—Tuition Difficulties of Officers on Active Service, 297.

Navy, Royal—Indian Contribution to Up-keep, 245.

Bengal

Disturbances in, 203.

Labour Unrest in, 251.

Legislative Council—Publicity Department Grant Refused, 177, 268.

Munitions Department Fraud Case, 262, 267, 270, 277, 296.

Police

Abolition Proposed, 286.

Alleged Inadequate to Cope with Dacoities, 186.

Grant Reduced, 79.

No British Officers to be Appointed to, 295.

Vote Modification, 141.

Reserved Departments Grants Reduction, 113.

Bennett, Sir T. J.

Aden—Traders' Views on Transfer of Administration to Colonial Office, 250.

Auxiliary Force Bill — Recruiting Statistics, 14.

Bombay—Population Statistics, 129.

Calcutta—Population Statistics, 129.

Civil Service

Public Works Department—Technical Allowance, 95.

Refund of Four per cent. Contribution Requested, 91.

Indian Emergency Committee, Views of Indian Legislature on, 76.

Railways

Administration Criticised, 290.

Goods Rates Increase, 61, 218.

Stores

Couchman Committee's Report on Purchase, 17.

Regulations as to Purchase, 250, 290.

Sukkur Barrage Scheme—Inquiry Committee Requested, 260.

Bhagalpur

Criticism of Prosecution Administration—Grant Case, 310.

Blind Welfare

Treatment and Care of Afflicted Persons, 209.

Bokhara

Bolshevik Forces in, 300.

Bolshevism

Activities in India, 76.

Frontier Disturbances Alleged Financed by Soviet Funds, 121, 126.

Gold not Prohibited in India, 115.

Position in Afghanistan and Bokhara, 300.

Rouble Notes Illegal in India, 95.

Bombay

Bonfire of British Clothing Organised, 253, 268.

Legislative Council—Sex Disqualification for Franchise Removed, 253.

Population Statistics, 129.

Smallpox, Compulsory Vaccination against, 278.

Bowyer, Captain G. W. E.

Oudh and Rohilkund Railway—Pay Rates not Increased, 92.

Boyd-Carpenter, Major A.

Army—Effect of Exchange Rates on Pay, 331.

British Army in India

Marriage Allowance not to be Issued, 239.

Pay

Effect of Exchange Rate on, 152, 191,

204, 260.

Officers' Rates, 145.

Troops in India Before War and Now, 26.

British Guiana

Colonisation Scheme, 308.

British North Borneo Company

Publication of Correspondence Requested, 4.

Bromfield, Mr. W.

Smallpox, Deaths from, in 1918, 279.

Bruton, Sir J.

Civil Service—Memorial from Central Association, Resolution as to, 274.

Buckley, Lieut.-Colonel A.

Army — Pensions — Re-assessment for Officers who Held High Civil Appointments, 221.

Legislative Assembly—Franchise for Retired Indian Officers of Indian Army, 221.

Bulgaria

Representation at London Conference, 7.

Bureaucracy

Growth Since Montagu-Chelmsford Report Alleged, 227.

Burma

Boycotting of Loyalists—Extremists Imprisoned, 340.

College Strike, 63.

Constitutional Reform—Popular Opposition Alleged, 161.

Rangoon Rice "Corner," 209.

Repression Policy Alleged, 114.

Revenue not Expended on Development, 100.

Shikho Custom Continuance, 98.

Shwe Dagon Pagoda

Evacuation by Military, 19, 64.

Restoration to Trustees, 161.

Burn, Colonel C. E.

Bengal — Munitions Department Fraud Case, 277.

Connaught, H.R.H. Duke of, Appreciation of Services Rendered on Tour by, 75.

17 Feb.—19 Dec., 1921.

Calcutta

- Letter Addressed by Registrar of University to Government, 168.
- Population Statistics, 129.
- Port of Calcutta Pensions not to be Increased, 262.
- Smallpox, Compulsory Vaccination against, 278.

Carter, Mr. W.

- Industrial Disputes—Number of Persons on Strike, 62.

Cattle Slaughter

- Cessation Requested, 141.

Cavendish-Bentinck, Lord H.

- Army—Service Outside India, 51.

Cecil, Rt. Hon. Lord H.

- Administration—Imperial Parliament's Right to Interfere, 30.

Census

- Indians Abroad, Counting of, 115.

Central Provinces

- Abolition of Commissioners of Divisions, 326.
- Legislative Council—Increased Pay of Provincial Service Officers not Sanctioned, 330.

Ceylon

- Immigration Restrictions, 206.

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. A.—Lord Privy Seal and Leader of the House

- Army
 - Committee Considering Reconstruction, 93, 168.
 - Strength Reduction — Return Requested, 267.
- Connaught, H.R.H. Duke of, Appreciation of Services Rendered on Tour by, 75.
- Government of Burma Bill—Date of Procedure, 258.
- Imperial Defence Committee—Sub-Committee Considering Army Strength, 304.
- Indian Affairs—Debate Requested, 288.
- Islamic Delegation — Credentials, Cost, and Selection of Mr. Kidwai, 208.
- Preservation of Order—Notice of Motion in House of Commons, 309, 325.

Churchill, Rt. Hon. W. S.—Secretary of State for the Colonies

- Hong Kong—Child Adoption, Legislation Requested, 9.
- Imperial Conference—Arrangements for Meeting, 9.
- Mesopotamian Mandate—Annual Cost to Britain, 4.
- Palestine Mandate—Cost to Britain, 4.

Cinematograph Films

- Censorship Established, 327.

Civil Service

- Administrative Rank, Expectation of Service before Reaching, 187.

Civil Service—cont.

- Bonus
 - Grant to Retired Officials Requested, 212.
- Sliding Scale, 90.
- Breach of Contract—Rights of British-born Subjects, 94.
- Candidates—Proportion of Europeans at Examinations, 264, 291.
- Contracts between Officials and Government, 101.
- Denning, Dr. A. D., Case, 40, 104, 109.
- Discontent Alleged at Lack of Improvements in Pay and Pension, 184.
- District Officers' Financial Difficulties, 207.
- Educational Service — Proportion of British and Indian Officials, 158.
- Memorials
 - Complaining of Increasing Difficulties of Public Service, 226.
 - From Central Association, Resolution as to, 274.
- Pensions
 - Forest and Public Works Department, 2, 47, 144.
 - Increase Limited, 1.
 - O'Dwyer, Sir M., 156.
- Proportional
 - Applications for, 149.
 - Conditions of Issue, 37, 194, 213, 227, 280, 291, 310.
- Reassessment of Cases Retired Prior to 1913, 38, 145.
- Revision of Scales for Officers Remaining on Old Terms, 188.
- Smith, Mr. B., Case, 156.
- Uncovenanted Cases, 1.
- Press and Platform—Regulations Regarding Relations with, 128.
- Public Works Department
 - Officer Electing to Serve under New Rules, 187.
 - Pay Increase Memorial, 87.
 - Secretary's Salary, 87.
 - Technical Allowance, 95.
- Reduction of Establishment—Compensation for Discharge, 188.
- Refund of Four per Cent. Contribution Requested, 91.
- War Service to Count towards Pension, 212.

Clough, Sir R.

- Exchange Rates
 - Depreciation of Rupee, 136.
 - Evasion of Contracts on Account of Low Exchange, 65.
- Merchants' Refusal to Trade on Rate other than 10 Rupees to the £, 34.
- German Missionaries to be Re-admitted, 83.
- Imports—Uncleared Goods Due to Exchange Rates, 25.

Coal

- Export without Licence Prohibited, 273.

Cochin

- Harbour Scheme Progress, 197.

Cockerill, Brig.-General G. K.

- Colonisation—No Restrictions on British Subjects, 118.

17 Feb.—19 Dec., 1921.

Collins, Sir G. P.

Income Tax, Rates of, 169.
Mesopotamia—M'Arthur, D., Case, 154.

Colonisation

No Restrictions on British Subjects, 118.

Colvin, Brig-General R. B.

Army Medical Service—English Leave
Delayed through War Conditions, 211.

Connaught, H.R.H. Duke of

Appreciation of Services Rendered on Tour
by, 75.

Cost of Living

Statistics Requested, 53.

Cotton

Import Duties Increase, 91, 248, 249, 262.
Mills
Capital, Profits and Taxation Statistics,
70.
Dividends Paid, 222.
Revenue Derived from Duty on, 67.

Council of State

Discussion on Budget not Permitted, 156,
299.

Craik, Rt. Hon. Sir H.

Administration—Imperial Parliament's
Right to Interfere, 23, 28.
Bengal Police Grant Reduced, 80.
Indian Affairs Committee—Terms of Refer-
ence, 68.
Madras—Non-Brahmin Agitation and
Election Results, 124.

"Nyanma Taingkyo Thadinsa"—Publication

by Government, 86.
Punjab Legislative Council Ministers—
Har Kishan Lal's Appointment, 16.

Croft, Lieut.-Colonel H. P.

Aitken, Colonel, Recompense for, 306, 319.
Army

Committee Considering Re-organisation,
93.

Strength Reduction
Proposals, 12.
Return Requested, 266.

British Army Pay
Effect of Exchange Rate on, 191.
Officers Serving in India, 145.

Civil Service

Administrative Rank, Expectation of
Service before Reaching, 187.
Pensions—Revision of Scales for Officers
Remaining on Old Terms, 188.
Public Works Officers Electing to Serve
Under New Rules, 187.
Reduction of Establishment—Com-
pensation for Discharge, 188.
East African 1914 Operations
Compensation for Colonel Aitken, 132.
Responsibility for Failure, 305.
Imperial Defence Committee—Cavalry
Reductions Considered, 106.

Curzon, Viscount

Administration—Imperial Parliament's
Right to Interfere, 22.
Army—Proportion between European and
Native Troops, 127.

Curzon, Viscount—cont.

Bolshevism—Frontier Disturbances
Alleged Financed by Soviet Funds,
126.

Gandhi, Mr.

Declaration of Active Resistance to
Laws, 283.

Reception by Viceroy, 164.

Statement Regarding Viceroy's Alleged
Views on Non-Co-operation, 174.

Legislative Councils—Review of Work by
Imperial Parliament, 40.

Malegaon, Rioting at, 137, 149, 155.

Mesopotamia Mandate—Annual Cost to
Britain, 4.

Moplah Rebellion

Position of Affairs, 322.

Statement Requested, 292.

Motor Cars—Chassis Ordered from Italy,
35.

Naihati, Riots Reported at, 18.

Non-Co-operation

Activities of Mr. Gandhi and Ali
Brothers, 228.

Bonfire of British Clothing at Bombay,
253, 268.

Boycott of British Cloth, 303.

Palestine Mandate—Cost to Britain, 4.

Punjab Legislative Council Ministers—
Har Kishan Lal's Appointment, 15.

Riots—Particulars of Occurrences in
March, 99.

Royal Indian Marine—Organisation into
Indian Navy, 109.

Dangerous Drugs

Regulation of Use, 50.

Davidson, Major-General Sir J. H.

Army—Esher Report Recommendations,
33.

British Army—Troops in India Before
War and Now, 26.

Davies, Mr. A. (Clitheroe)

Cotton—Import Duties and Competition
of Local Manufactories, 248.

Davies, Mr. Alfred T.

Burma—Rangoon Rice "Corner," 209.

Imperial Conference—Arrangements for
Meeting, 9.

Rice—Alleged Formation of "Corner,"
208.

Davison, Sir W. H.

Administration—Imperial Parliament's
Right to Interfere, 24.

Civil Service

Candidates,—Proportion of Europeans
at Examination, 264.

Discontent Alleged at Lack of Improve-
ments in Pay and Pension, 184.

Divorce Decrees, Validation of, 60.

Elections—Statistics Requested, 257.

Gandhi, Mr., Birthplace of, 322.

Legislative Councils

Review of Work by Imperial Parlia-
ment, 39.

Safeguarding of Rights of H.M.'s
Servants, 39.

Police—Pay Memorials Presented, 19.

Prerogative of Mercy, Persons Vested
with, 26.

Davison, Sir W. H.—cont.

Punjab Legislative Council Ministers—
Har Kishan Lal's Appointment, 14.
Secretary of State, Powers of, 27.
Sukkur Barrage—Opposition to Scheme,
249.

Delhi

Cost of Construction of New City, 220.

Demobilization

Delays at Bombay, 117, 131.
Delays at Deolali, 131, 163, 180, 198.
Grievance of Officers Delayed for Months,
186.

Deolali

Camp Conditions, 198.
Demobilization Delays, 131, 163, 180, 198.

Divorce Decrees

Validation of, 60, 70, 131, 175.

Dockrell, Sir M.

Waziristan—Jandola Huts Case, 327.

East African 1914 Operations

Compensation for Colonel Aitken, 132.
Responsibility for Failure, 305.

Edge, Captain W.

Moplah Rebellion—Statement Requested,
293.

Egret Feathers

Export Prohibited, 120, 129.
Inquiry into Farming Allegations Re-
garded as too Expensive, 340.

Elections

Deposit Required from each Candidate,
34, 205.
Statistics Requested, 13, 44, 121, 257.

Emigration

British Guiana Scheme, 308.
Regulating by Legislation Deprecated,
243.

Emigration Bill

Restrictions placed upon Ceylon, 206.

Established Church

Upkeep Charge on Indian Revenue, 119.

Exchange Rates

Depreciation of Rupee, 136.
Evasion of Contracts on Account of Low
Exchange, 65.
Japan, Position of Officers Studying in,
185, 277.
Merchants' Refusal to Trade on Rate other
than 10 Rupees to the £, 34.
Stabilisation of Rupee, 20.

Exports Credits Scheme

Exclusion of India from, 214.

Falle, Major Sir B. G.

Army—Leave Pay—Callaghan Case, 214.

Fiji

Committee Formed to Visit, and Enquire
into Colonists' Grievances, 221.

Finance

Excise Revenue Statistics, 138.
Financial Statement and Budget Return
Ordered, 183.
Fiscal Policy of Government, 277.
Gold Standard Reserve, 147.
Income and Expenditure Return Ordered,
152.
Pensions Payable to Men Concerned in
Punjab Disturbances, 156.
Revenue Statistics Requested, 203.
Reverse Councils, Loss on Sale of, 231,
254.
Statement
1921-22, 70.
Requested, 325.
Sterling Loan—Expenditure on Purchase
of British Railway Material, 178, 183.

Fiscal Commission

Consideration of Trade Interests Involved,
289.
List of Questions Issued by, 332.
Personnel—Particulars Requested, 54.
Policy Required by India, 66.
Terms of Reference, 289.

**Fisher, Rt. Hon. H. A. L.—President of
the Board of Education**

Army
Cavalry—Allotment of Duties for In-
ternal Security, 276.
Pay—Concessions to Officers Studying in
Japan, 277.
Strength Reduction—White Paper Pub-
lication Requested, 276.
Bengal—Munitions Department Fraud
Case, 277.
Fiscal Policy of Government, 277.

Flannery, Sir J. F.

Motor Cars—Chassis Ordered from Italy,
35.
Overseas Settlement—Officers and Men of
Indian Army Ineligible for Grant of
Passages, 132.

Forrest, Mr. W.

Bulgaria—Representation at London Con-
ference, 7.
Madras—Land in Public Park Given for
Erection of Theatre, 116.
Waziristan, Casualties, and Situation in,
150.

France, Mr. G. A.

Railways—Surcharge on Inland Water
Traffic, 65.

Fraser, Major Sir K.

Army—Silladar Cavalry Regiments' Dis-
bandment, 152.

Freece, Sir W. de

Afghanistan — Treaty Negotiations in
Progress, 144.
Cotton Import Duty Increase, 91, 249.
Singapore—Seditious Literature Prosecu-
tions, 152.

17 Feb.—19 Dec., 1921.

Fremantle, Lieut.-Colonel F. E.

Army—Re-organisation Proposals, 84.

Gandhi, Mr.

Birthplace of, 321.

Declaration of Active Resistance to Laws, 283.

Reception by Viceroy, 164.

Statement Regarding Viceroy's Alleged Views on Non-Co-operation, 174.

Gaols Committee

Minutes of Evidence not to be Published, 177.

Publication of Report, 156.

Gee, Captain R.

Cotton Mills—Dividends Paid, 223.

Moplah Rebellion—Compulsory Conversion of Hindus to Mahommedanism, 298.

Students—Facilities for Industrial Study in United Kingdom, 176.

George, Rt. Hon. D. Lloyd—Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury

Bolshevism—Frontier Attack on British Convoys Alleged Financed by Soviet Funds, 121.

Imperial Defence Committee—Cavalry Reductions Considered, 106.

Prerogative of Mercy, Person Vested with, 27.

Punjab 1919 Disturbances—Treatment of Officers Concerned in Suppressing, 329.

Secretary of State, Powers of, 27.

Sevres Treaty, Modification of, 62.

German Indemnity

India's Claim to a Share of, 135, 253.

Germans

Missionaries to be Re-admitted, 83.

Gibbs, Lieut.-Colonel G. A.

Opium Trade Statistics, 339.

Gilbert, Mr. J. D.

Dangerous Drugs—Regulation of Use, 50.

India Office—Belvedere Road Stores Department Pensionable Employés, 158.

Opium

Supplies to Hong Kong, 48.

Trade Statistics, 339.

Gilmour, Lieut.-Colonel Sir J.—Lord*Commissioner of the Treasury*

Cadets—Selection for Indian Army Voluntary, 190.

Legislative Councils—Publicity Offices Alleged not Encouraged, 191.

Non-Co-operation—Arbitration Courts Established, 190.

Glyn, Major R.

Amritsar—Sikh Regiment Insubordination Denied, 117.

Army

Medical Services

Appeal Rights, 133.

British-Born Officers, Number and Position of, 142.

Overseas Service of Native Regiments, 116.

Glyn, Major R.—cont.

Delhi—Cost of Construction of New City, 220.

Printing, Annual Government Expenditure on, 321.

Railways

Machinery Orders, Restrictions on, 319.

Policy Regarding Inquiry Committee's Report, 320.

Government of Burma Bill

Date of Introduction, 37.

Date of Procedure, 258.

Government Decision not to Proceed with, 274.

Græco-Turkish Hostilities

Anxiety in India as to British Neutrality, 265.

Griffiths, Mr. T.

Civil Service

Breach of Contract—Rights of British-born Subjects, 94.

Denning, Dr. A. D., Case, 40, 104, 109.

India Office—High Court Cases—Solicitors Employed, 100.

Rice—Government Control Depreciated, 307.

Grundy, Mr. T. W.

Blind Welfare—Treatment and Care of Afflicted Persons, 209.

Guinness, Lieut.-Colonel Hon. W. E.

Army

Medical Services—Pay Increase Antedating, 116.

Pay Increases Sanctioned, 10.

Gujranwalla

Railway Station Moved from, 88, 135.

Gwalior

Newspapers Forbidden in, 193, 285.

Gwynne, Mr. R. S.

Army

Medical Service Promotion, 18.

Pensions—Retirement Delayed Owing to War, 327.

Strength Reduction Proposals, 12.

Bengal—Police Grant Reduced, 79.

Demobilization Delays at Deolali, 165.

Deolali—Camp Conditions, 198.

Gold Standard Reserve, 147.

Government of Burma Bill—Government Decision not to Proceed with, 274.

India Office—Printing of Despatches Depreciated, 17.

Islamic Delegation

Credentials and Cost, 198, 207, 215.

Kidwai, Mr., Selection of, 198, 207, 215.

Questions—Ministers Failing to Answer, 208.

Sedition

Conspiracy—Convictions and Pardons, 85.

Speeches Delivered by Ali Brothers—Apology and Undertaking Made, 216.

United States of America—Silver Dollars Purchase and Annual Rupee Credit, 130.

17 Feb.—19 Dec., 1921.

Haifwood, Mr. A.

Shajungi — Boycott of British Goods Vowed, 110.

Hall, Colonel Sir F.

Army Pay—Effect of Adverse Exchange Rate, 107, 111.

Bengal Munitions Department Fraud Case, 262, 267.

Bolshevism—Activities in India, 76.

British Army—Effect of Exchange Rate on Pay, 162, 191, 260.

Sedition—Speeches of Mr. Andrews, 181.

Hannon, Mr. P. J. H.

Land Revenue Statistics, 194.

Har Kishan Lal

Appointed to Legislative Council of Punjab, 14.

Hayday, Mr. A.

Smallpox—Compulsory Vaccination, 278.

Herbert, Hon. A.

Army Medical Expenses—A. E. Brown Case, 57.

Græco-Turkish Hostilities — Anxiety in India as to British Neutrality, 265.

Herbert, Mr. D.

Divorce Decrees, Validation of, 175.

Hewart, Rt. Hon. Sir G.—Attorney-General

Divorce Decrees, Validation of, 61.

High Court Judges

Appointment Regulations, 124.

Creation of an Indian Bar Proposed, 124.

Hoare, Lieut.-Colonel Sir S. J. G.

Army Disbandment

Cavalry Officers' Future, 208.

Pre-War Infantry Battalions, 225.

India Office Legal Department—Painter Case, 306.

Hogge, Mr. J. M.

Domobilization — Grievance of Officers Delayed for Months, 186.

Holbrook, Colonel Sir A. R.

Army—Decoration for Reserve of Officers, 2, 46.

Civil Service

Bonus Grant to Retired Officials Requested, 212.

Pensions

Forests and Public Works Department, 2, 47, 144.

Reassessment of Cases Retired Prior to 1913, 145.

War Service to Count towards Pension, 212.

Homeward Passages

Cheapening of Cost, 33, 68, 168, 185, 265, 307.

Hong Kong

Child Adoption—Legislation Requested, 8.

Opium Supplied from India, 48.

Hopkinson, Mr. A.

Railways—Surcharge on Inland Water Traffic, 66.

Hurst, Lieut.-Colonel G. B.

Finance — Loss on Sale of Reverse Councils, 231, 254.

Imperial Conference

Arrangements for Meeting, 9.

Decisions as to Indian Co-operation in Empire Defence, 270.

Imperial Defence Committee

Cavalry Reductions Considered, 106.

Sub-Committee Considering Army Strength, 304.

Imports

Duty Increases, 43, 91.

Uncleared Goods Due to Exchange Rates, 25.

Income Tax

Army Officers Serving in Mesopotamia, 185.

Rates of, 169.

"Independent" Newspaper

Imprisonment of Publisher, 249.

Indian Affairs

Debate Requested, 288.

Indian Affairs Committee

Appointment of, 58.

Terms of Reference, 68.

Indian Arms Act

British Residents' Alleged Dissatisfaction, 25.

Indian Divorces (Validity Bill)
Com. 210. *Rep.** and *3a.** 210.

Indian Emergency Committee

Views of Indian Legislature on, 76.

Indian Students' Committee

Personnel and Terms of Reference, 195.

Report of, 299.

India Office

Annual Leave Arrangements, 243.

Belvedere Road Stores Department Pensionable Employés, 158.

High Court Cases—Solicitors Employed, 100.

Legal Department—Painter Case, 306, 323.

Printing of Despatches Deprecated, 17.

Salaries Exceeding £1,000 per annum, 189.

Staff Pensions Increase, 233.

Industrial Disputes

Number of Persons on Strike, 62.

International Labour Conference

Indian Delegates to, 93.

Islamic Delegation

Credentials and Cost, 198, 207, 215.

Kidwai, Mr.; Selection of, 198, 207, 215.

17 Feb.—19 Dec., 1921.

Jainagar

Sentence on Woman Ordered by Non-Co-operation Arbitration Court, 190.

James, Lieut.-Colonel Hon. C.

Army—Chargers, Hardships Entailed upon Officers Compelled to Purchase, 255.
 Bolshevism—Frontier Attacks on British Convoys Alleged Financed by Soviet Funds, 121.

Japan

Exchange Concessions for Indian Army Officers Studying in, 185, 277.
 National Defence, Cost of, 235, 269, 284.

Johnson, Colonel F.

Oil Concession Alleged Granted to, 114.

Jones, Mr. H. H.

Karachi Aerodrome Detention Allowance—Handsford and Pughe Case, 324.

Jones, Rev. J. T.—Lord Commissioner of the Treasury

Army—Badges and Shoulder Titles Alterations, 151.

Joynson-Hicks, Sir W.

Administration—Imperial Parliament's Right to Interfere, 22, 31.

Army**Disbandment**

Cavalry Regiments, 10.
 Pre-War Infantry Battalions, 224.

Re-organisation

Committee Considering, 92.
 Proposals, 83.

Strength Reduction

Enquiries by Imperial Defence Committee, 241.
 Proposals, 11, 52.

Bengal

Munitions Department Fraud Case, 296.
 Reserve Departments Grants Reduction, 113.

Bureaucracy—Growth Since Montagu-Chelmsford Report Alleged, 227.

Civil Service Pensions

Increase Limited, 1.
 Proportional—Conditions of Issue, 37, 227, 291, 310.

Elections—Statistics Requested, 13.

Imperial Defence Committee—Sub-Committee Considering Army Strength, 304.

Imports—Duty Increases and Imperial Preference, 43.

Indian Affairs—Debate Requested, 288.

Indian Emergency Committee, Views of Indian Legislature on, 77.

Legislative Councils—Secretariats' Salaries, 220.

Moplah Rebellion

Repressive Acts—Repeal Alleged not Justified, 304.

Statement Requested, 292.

Preservation of Order—Notice of Motion in House of Commons, 308, 325.

Punjab Legislative Council Ministers—Har Kishan Lal's Appointment, 16.

Joynson-Hicks, Sir W.—cont.

Rawlinson, Lord—Council of State Speech Denials, 52.

Self-Government, Extension of, 300.

Waziristan—Report on Situation, 281.

Karachi

Aerodrome Detention Allowance—Handsford and Pughe Case, 324.

Kellaway, Rt. Hon. F. G.—Postmaster-General

Mail Delays—Irregularity Deprecated, 260, 263.

Telegraph Cables—Progress of Repair Work, 247.

Kelley, Major F.

Railways—Placing of Stores Orders, 169.

Kenworthy, Lieut. - Commander Hon. J. M.

Army—Disbandment of Cavalry Regiments, 11.

Bolshevism—Rouble Notes Illegal in India, 96.

German Indemnity, India's Claim to a Share of, 135.

Mesopotamian Mandate—Annual Cost to Britain, 6.

Mail Delays—Irregularity Deprecated, 260, 263.

Opium

Prohibition of Export to China, 78.

Shipment Statistics Requested, 49.

Russia—Representation at London Conference, 8.

Kenyon, Mr. B.

Waziristan—Makin Bombed after Attack on Ladha Piquets, 120.

Kiley, Mr. J. D.**Egret Feathers**

Export Prohibited, 129.

Inquiry into Farming Allegations
 Regarded as too Expensive, 340.

Kuki Hills

Medal for Operations in, Proposed, 164.

Kumaun

Forests—Destroyed by Non-Co-operators, 215.

Lahore

Viceroy's Visit to Consider Gardwaras Shrines Dispute, 155.

Fire Brigade Superintendent Ordered to Wear Gandhi's Uniform, 298, 328.

Lambert, Rt. Hon. G.

Mesopotamian Mandate—Annual Cost to Britain, 6.

Palestine Mandate—Cost to Britain, 6.

Land Revenue

Statistics, 194.

Law, Rt. Hon. A. B.—Lord Privy Seal and Leader of the House

Bulgaria—Representation at London Conference, 8.

cont.

Law, Rt. Hon. A. B.—cont.

- Mesopotamian Mandate—Annual Cost to Britain, 5.
- Russia—Representation at London Conference, 8.

Legislative Assembly

- Franchise for Retired Indian Officers of Indian Army, 213, 221.

Legislative Councils

- Publicity Offices Alleged not Encouraged, 191, 294.
- Review of Work by Imperial Parliament, 39.
- Safeguarding of Rights of H.M.'s Servants, 39.
- Salaries of Ministers in Charge of Transferred Subjects, 285.
- Secretariats' Salaries, 220.
- Standing Committees' Attachment to Provincial Government Departments, 120.
- Veto Exercised by Lieutenant-Governors, 242, 252.

Lindsay, Mr. W. A.

- Army Disbandment—Case of 80th Carnatic Infantry, 217.

London Conference

- Cost of, 8.

Loseby, Captain C. E.

- India Office Legal Department—Painter Case, 323.

Lowe, Sir F. W.

- Bengal—Reserve Departments Grants Reduction, 113.

Lyallpur

- Imprisonment of Dr. Kitchlew and Mr. Rambhaji Dutt, 88, 126.

Lyle, Mr. C. E. L.

- Preservation of Order
- Outlook for Latter Half of 1921, 197.
- Situation in India, 219.
- Sutlej River—Hydro-Electric Scheme, 90, 142.

McCurdy, Rt. Hon. C. A.—Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury

- Allahabad—University Examiners' Adverse Report on Quality of Work, 122.
- Elections—Statistics of Voters Requested, 121.

McDonald, Dr. B. F. P.

- Civil Service Pensions—Reassessment of Pre-1913 Cases, 38.

Maclean, Rt. Hon. Sir D.

- Finance Statement, 1921-22, 70.
- Waziristan—Position of Affairs, 228.

M'Micking, Major G.

- British Army Pay, Effect of Exchange Rate on, 192, 204.

M'Neill, Mr. R.

- Administration—Imperial Parliament's Right to Interfere, 31.

Macquisten, Mr. F. A.

- Burma—Revenue not Expended on Development, 100.

Madras

- Buckingham Carnatic Mills Lock-Out, 248.
- Land in Public Park Given for Erection of Theatre, 116.
- Legislative Council—Sex Disqualification for Franchise Removed, 137, 175, 253.
- Non-Brahmin Agitation and Election Results, 123.
- Smallpox
- Compulsory Vaccination, 278.
- Epidemics, 261.
- Speech by Mohammed Ali, 122, 136.
- Strikes
- Progress of, 242.
- Report on Situation, 230.
- Statement Requested, 234.

Madras Military Fund

- Increases in Pensions Requested, 128.
- Particulars of Assets and Interest, 179.

Madras Presidency

- Extension of Permanent Settlement System, 238.
- Land Revenue Increase, 264.

Mail Delays

- Irregularity Depreciated, 260, 263.

Malabar

- Moplah Rebellion. *See that Title.*

Malegaon

- Rioting at, 137, 149, 155.

Manville, Mr. E.

- Motor Cars
- Chassis Ordered from Italy, 34.
- Samples Provided by British Firms, 35.

Marriott, Mr. J. A. R.

- Civil Service Pensions — Uncovenanted Cases, 1.

Mesopotamia

- M'Arthur, D., Case, 154.
- Mandate—Annual Cost to Britain, 4.

Microscopes

- American Contract for, 165.

Mills, Mr. J. E.

- Government of Burma Bill—Date of Introduction, 37.

Mitchell - Thomson, Sir W. — Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade

- Bengal—Police Vote Modification, 141.
- Waziristan, Situation in, 141.

Mohammed Ali

- See Ali Brothers.*

Monasite Sand

- British Control of Supply, 229.
- No Foreign-Owned Company Controlling Sale, 244.

17 Feb.—19 Dec., 1921.

Mond, Rt. Hon. Sir A. M.—*First Commissioner of Works*

London Conference, Cost of, 8.

Montagu, Rt. Hon. E. S.—*Secretary of State for India*

Aden

Colonial Office to Administer, 44.

Traders' Views on Transfer of Administration to Colonial Office, 251.

Afghanistan

Bolshevik Positions in, 300.

Subsidy Payable to Amir, 116.

Treaty Negotiations in Progress, 97, 144.

Aitken, Colonel, Recompense for, 306, 319.

Ali Brothers, Birthplace of, 322.

Aligarh, Disturbances at, 233.

Allahabad—Acquisition of Bungalow in New Cantonment, 236.

Amritsar—Sikh Regiment Insubordination Denied, 118.

Andamans—Prison System Report Publication, 89.

Army

Auditing of Accounts, 163.

Bands Upkeep Arrangements, 46.

Cadets

Entering from Sandhurst, 87.

1916 Candidates, Future of, 157.

Chargers

Hardships Entailed upon Officers

Compelled to Purchase, 255.

Purchase at Concessional Rates, 90.

Codrington, K. de B., Case, 146.

Comparative Strengths of Cavalry in European Countries, 157.

Cost of British and Indian Soldier per annum, 122.

Differentiation between Married and Single Officers, 245.

Disbandment

Cavalry Reductions, 10, 138, 160.

80th Carnatic Infantry, Case of, 218.

List of Units Concerned, 111.

Particulars of, 101.

Pre-War Infantry Battalions to be Disbanded, 148, 224, 280.

Proceeding after Undertaking of Cessation, 119, 126, 236, 257.

Surplus British Cavalry Officers, Future of, 208, 284, 294, 330.

Esher Committee's Recommendations, 13, 33, 37, 96, 197.

Field Service Batta for Afghanistan and Waziristan Operations, 291.

Housing of Officers, 32.

King's India Cadets to Enter Indian Army, 33.

Language Examinations

Alleged Increased Difficulty of, 278.

Tuition Difficulties of Officers on Active Service, 297.

Leave Pay—Callaghan Case, 214.

Machine Gun Corps Incorporated in Cavalry and Infantry Units, 113.

Marriage Allowance not Issuable to Officers, 317.

Medical Expenses—A. E. Brown Case, 57.

Montagu, Rt. Hon. E. S.—*cont.*

Army—*cont.*

Medical Services

Appeal Rights, 134.

British-Born Officers, Number and Position of, 143.

English Leave Delayed through War Conditions, 211.

Pay Increase Antedating, 117.

Promotion, 18.

Travelling Facilities, 69.

Mess Dress, Wearing of, 242.

Military Accounts Department to be Reorganised, 45.

Overseas Service of Native Regiments, 116.

Pay

Delay in Payments to Officers Returning to India from Overseas, 111.

Effect of Exchange Rates on, 108, 111, 331.

Increases, 10, 50, 237.

Royal Engineers Officers' Rates, 178.

Pensions

Brevet Rank and, 317.

Reassessment of Officers who have Held High Civil Appointments, 10, 111, 171, 244, 286.

Retirement Delayed Owing to War, 164, 302, 327.

Wife an Innocent Party in Divorce Suit, Position of, 172.

Withheld for Grave Misconduct, Hennessy Case, 172.

Proportion of European and Native Troops, 127.

Re-organisation Proposals, 83.

Reserve of Officers, Decoration for, 3, 47.

Service Outside India, 52.

Silladar Cavalry Regiments' Disbandment, 153.

Strength Reduction

Allotment of Cavalry to Provinces, 256.

Basis of, 182.

Inquiries by Imperial Defence Committee, 241.

Number of Units not under Disbandment Orders, 269.

Position Regarding Continued Tribal Risings, 173.

Proposals, 11, 52, 96.

Return Requested, 266.

Travelling Concessions for Officers, 45, 64.

Assam

Coolies' Exodus—Position of Affairs, 199, 204, 205, 251.

Coolies' Unrest, 166.

Auxiliary Force Act

Compulsory Methods of Recruitment, 173.

Recruiting Statistics, 13, 148, 159.

Behar and Orissa

Village Industries Scheme Promoted, 297.

Village Self-Government Proposals, 176.

Bengal

Disturbances in, 204.

Labour Unrest in, 251.

Legislative Council—Publicity Department Grant Refused, 177, 268.

cont.

17 Feb.—19 Dec., 1921.

Montagu, Rt. Hon. E. S.—cont.

Bengal—cont.

Munitions Department Fraud Case, 262, 267, 270, 296.

Police

Abolition Proposed, 287.

Alleged Inadequate to Cope with Dacoities, 187.

Grant Reduced, 79.

No British Officers to be Appointed to, 295.

Reserve Departments Grants Reduction, 113.

Blind Welfare—Treatment and Care of Afflicted Persons, 209.

Bokhara, Bolshevik Forces in, 300.

Bolshevism

Activities in India, 76.

Frontier Disturbances Alleged Financed by Soviet Funds, 127.

Gold not Prohibited in India, 115.

Rouble Notes Illegal in India, 96.

Bombay

Legislative Council—Sex Disqualification for Franchise Removed, 254.

Population Statistics, 129.

British Army in India

Marriage Allowance not to be Issued, 240.

Pay

Effect of Exchange Rate on, 162, 192, 205, 261.

Officers Serving in India, 145.

Troops in India Before War and Now, 26.

British Guiana Colonisation Scheme, 308.

Bureaucracy — Growth Since Montagu-Chelmsford Report Alleged, 227.

Burma

Boycotting of Loyalists—Extremists Imprisoned, 340.

College Strike, 64.

Constitutional Reform—Popular Opposition Alleged, 161.

Rangoon Rice "Corner," 209.

Repression Policy Alleged, 115.

Revenue not Expended on Development, 101.

Shwe Dagon Pagoda

Evacuation by Military, 19, 64.

Restoration to Trustees, 162.

Calcutta

Population Statistics, 129.

Port of Calcutta Pensions not to be Increased, 262.

Cattle Slaughter—Cessation Requested, 142.

Census—Counting of Indians Abroad, 115.

Central Provinces

Abolition of Commissioners of Divisions, 326.

Legislative Council—Increased Pay of Provincial Service Officers not Sanctioned, 330.

Cinematograph Films—Censorship Established, 327.

Civil Service

Administrative Rank, Expectation of Service Before Reaching, 188.

Bonus

Grant to Retired Officials Requested, 212.

Sliding Scale, 90.

Montagu, Rt. Hon. E. S.—cont.

Civil Service—cont.

Breach of Contract—Rights of British-born Subjects, 94.

Candidates—Proportion of Europeans at Examinations, 264, 291.

Contracts between Officials and Government, 102, 103.

Denning, Dr. A. D., Case, 40, 105, 110.

District Officers' Financial Difficulties, 207.

Memorials

Complaining of Increasing Difficulties of Public Service, 226.

From Central Association, Resolution as to, 274.

Pensions

Forest and Public Works Department, 2, 48, 144.

Increase Limited, 1.

Proportionate

Applications for, 149.

Conditions of Issue, 38, 194, 213, 227, 280, 291, 310.

Reassessment of Cases Retired Prior to 1913, 38, 146.

Revision of Scales for Officers remaining on Old Terms, 188.

Uncovenanted Cases, 1.

War Service to Count towards, 212.

Press and Platform, Regulations Regarding Relations with, 129.

Public Works Department

Officers Electing to Serve under New Rules, 187.

Pay Increase Memorial, 88.

Secretary's Salary, 87.

Technical Allowance, 95.

Reduction of Establishment—Compensation for Discharge, 188.

Refund of Four per cent. Contribution Requested, 91.

Coal Export without Licence Prohibited, 273.

Cochin Harbour Scheme Progress, 197.

Colonisation—No Restrictions on British Subjects, 118.

Cost of Living Statistics Requested, 54.

Cotton

Import Duties Increase, 92, 248, 250, 263.

Mills

Capital, Profits and Taxation Statistics, 70.

Dividends Paid, 223.

Revenue Derived from Duty on, 67.

Council of State—Discussion on Budget not Permitted, 156, 299.

Dangerous Drugs—Regulation of Use, 50.

Delhi—Cost of Construction of New City, 220.

Demobilisation Delays

Bombay, 117, 131.

Deolali, 131, 163, 165, 181.

Grievance of Officers Delayed for Months, 186.

Deolali

Camp Conditions, 198.

Demobilisation Delays, 131, 163, 165, 181.

Divorce Decrees, Validation of, 70, 132, 176.

East African 1914 Expedition—Responsibility for Failure, 305.

17 Feb.—19 Dec., 1921.

Montagu, Rt. Hon. E. S.—cont.

- Egret Feathers
- Inquiry into Farming Allegations Regarded as too Expensive, 340.
- Export Prohibited, 120, 129.
- Elections
 - Deposit Required from Candidates Proposed, 34.
 - Statistics Requested, 13, 44, 257.
- Emigration—Regulating by Legislation Deprecated, 243.
- Emigration Bill—Restrictions Placed upon Ceylon, 206.
- Established Church—Upkeep Charge on Indian Revenue, 119.
- Exchange Rates
 - Compensation for Army Officers, 91.
 - Depreciation of Rupee, 136.
 - Evasion of Contracts on Account of Low Exchange, 65.
 - Japan, Position of Officers Studying in, 185.
 - Merchants' Refusal to Trade on Rate other than 10 Rupees to the £, 34.
 - Stabilisation of Rupee, 20.
- Exports Credits Scheme, Exclusion of India from, 214.
- Fiji, Committee Formed to Visit, and Inquire into Colonists' Grievances, 221.
- Finance
 - Excise Revenue Statistics, 138.
 - Gold Standard Reserve, 147.
 - Pensions Payable to Men Concerned in Punjab Disturbances, 156.
 - Revenue Statistics Requested, 203.
 - Reverse Councils, Loss of Sale of, 232, 254.
- Statement
 - 1921-22, 71.
 - Requested, 325.
- Sterling Loan—Expenditure on Purchase of British Railway Material, 178, 183.
- Fiscal Commission
 - Consideration of Trade Interests Involved, 289.
 - List of Questions Issued by, 332.
 - Personnel Particulars Requested, 54.
 - Policy Required by India, 66.
 - Terms of Reference, 289.
- Gandhi, Mr.
 - Birthplace of, 322.
 - Declaration of Active Resistance to Laws, 284.
 - Reception by Viceroy, 164.
 - Statement Regarding Viceroy's Alleged Views on Non-Co-operation, 174.
- Gaols Committee
 - Minutes of Evidence not to be Published, 177.
 - Publication of Report, 156.
- German Indemnity, India's Claim to a Share of, 135, 253.
- German Missionaries to be Re-admitted, 83.
- Government of Burma Bill
 - Date of Introduction, 37.
 - Government Decision not to Proceed with, 274.
- Græco-Turkish Hostilities—Anxiety in India as to British Neutrality, 265.

Montagu, Rt. Hon. E. S.—cont.

- Gujranwala, Station Removed from, 88, 135.
- Gwalior, Newspapers Forbidden in, 193, 285.
- High Court Judges
 - Appointment Regulations, 125.
 - Creation of an Indian Bar Proposed, 125.
- Homeward Passages—Cheapening of Cost, 34, 68, 266, 307.
- Imperial Conference—Decisions as to Indian Co-operation in Empire Defence, 270.
- Imports
 - Duty Increases and Imperial Preference, 43.
 - Uncleared Goods Due to Exchange Rates, 25.
- Income Tax, Rates of, 170.
- "Independent" Newspaper—Imprisonment of Publisher, 249.
- Indian Affairs Committee
 - Appointment of, 59.
 - Terms of Reference, 68.
- Indian Arms Act—British Residents' Alleged Dissatisfaction, 26.
- Indian Divorces (Validity) Bill. *Com.* 210.
- Indian Emergency Committee, Views of Indian Legislature on, 77.
- Indian Students' Committee
 - Personnel and Terms of Reference, 195.
 - Report of, 299.
- India Office
 - Annual Leave Arrangements, 243.
 - High Court Cases—Solicitors Employed, 100.
 - Legal Department—Painter Case, 323.
 - Printing of Despatches Deprecated, 18.
 - Salaries Exceeding £1,000 per annum, 189.
 - Staff—Pensions Increase, 233.
- Industrial Disputes—Number of Persons on Strike, 62.
- Islamic Delegation
 - Credentials and Cost, 198.
 - Kidwai, Mr., Selection of, 198.
- Jallianwallah Bagh Shooting, Claims for Losses of Life at, 318.
- Japan—National Defence, Expenditure on, 269, 284.
- Johnson, Colonel F., Oil Concession Alleged Granted to, 114.
- Karachi—Aerodrome Detention Allowance, Handsford and Pughe Case, 324.
- Kuki Hills—Medal for Operations in, Proposed, 164.
- Kumaun—Forests Destroyed by Non-Co-operators, 215.
- Lahore
 - Fire Brigade Superintendent Ordered to Wear Gandhi Uniform, 329.
 - Viceroy's Visit to Consider Gardwaras Shrines Dispute, 155.
- Land Revenue Statistics, 194.
- Legislative Assembly—Franchise for Retired Indian Officers of the Indian Army, 214.
- Legislative Councils
 - Publicity Departments, Development of, 294.
 - Review of Work by Imperial Parliament, 39.

cont.

17 Feb.—19 Dec., 1921.

Montagu, Rt. Hon. E. S.—cont.Legislative Councils—*cont.*

Safeguarding of Rights of His Majesty's Servants, 39.

Salaries of Ministers in Charge of Transferred Subjects, 285.

Standing Committees' Attachment to Provincial Government Departments, 120.

Veto Exercised by Lieutenant-Governors, 242.

Lyallpur—Imprisonment of Dr. Kitchlew and Mr. Rambhaj Dutt, 89, 126.

Madras

Buckingham Carnatic Mills Lock-out, 248.

Land in Public Park Given for Erection of Theatre, 116.

Legislative Council—Sex Disqualification for Franchise Removed, 137, 175, 254.

Non-Brahmin Agitation and Election Results, 123.

Seditious Speeches by Mohammed Ali, 136.

Smallpox Epidemics, 261.

Strike

Progress of, 242.

Statement Requested, 234.

Madras Military Fund

Increases in Pensions Requested, 128.

Particulars of Assets and Interest, 179.

Madras Presidency—Land Revenue Increase, 264.

Malegaon, Rioting at, 137, 149, 155.

Microscopes, American Contract for, 166.

Monasite Sand

British Control of Supply, 229.

No Foreign-owned Company Controlling Sale, 244.

Moplah Rebellion

Compulsory Conversion of Hindus to Mahommedanism, 330.

Position of Affairs, 322, 337.

Repressive Acts—Repeal Alleged not Justified, 303.

Statement Requested, 292, 297.

Motor Cars

Chassis Ordered from Italy, 35, 45.

Samples Provided by British Firms, 36.

Nagpur, Disturbances at, 81.

Naihati, Riots Reported at, 18.

National Defence, Expenditure on, 235, 269, 284.

Navy, Royal—Indian Contribution to Upkeep, 245.

Newspapers—Editors and Proprietors not Compelled to be Registered, 222.

Non-Co-operation

Activities of Mr. Gandhi and Ali Brothers, 228.

Bonfire of British Clothing in Bombay, 253, 268.

Boycott of British Cloth, 303.

Free Railway Travel for Crowds Attending Meetings, 136.

Government Servants Wearing Gandhi Caps, 328.

Non-Brahmin Federation's Condemnation of, 20.

North-West Frontier Raid Statistics, 89.

Nyanma Taingkyo Thadinsa"—Publication by Government, 86.

Montagu, Rt. Hon. E. S.—cont.

Opium

Export to China Prohibited, 78, 265.

Shipment Statistics Requested, 49.

Supplies to Hong Kong, 48.

Oudhand Rohilkund Railway—Pay Rates not Increased, 92.

Peshawar—Citizens' Rights Alleged Infringed, 142.

Police

Medical Costs Incurred—Assistance to Meet Proposed, 287.

Pay

Increases Authorised, 238, 244.

Memorials Presented, 19.

Overseas Pay, Particulars of Increase, 287.

Rates, 46, 180.

Political Department—Pay Rates of Military Officers, 108.

Political Prisoners

Number Confined in Andamans and in India, 175.

Treatment of, 337.

Preservation of Order

Outlook for Latter Half of 1921, 197.

Repressive Methods Denied, 341.

Situation in India, 219.

Press Acts

Action Proposed on Report of Inquiry Committee, 274, 318.

Repeal Proposed, Views on, 301.

Printing, Annual Government Expenditure on, 321.

Prisons—Amelioration of Conditions Proposed, 186.

Pudukota—Visit of Mr. Satyamurti Forbidden, 183.

Punjab

Electoral Rules Criticised, 145.

Legislative Council

Ministers—Har Kishan Lal's Appointment, 15.

Publicity Department Grant Refused, 155, 177.

Nankana

Disturbances, 67.

Sikhs Murdered by Pathans, 135.

1919 Disturbances

Number of Persons in Prison since, 134, 144, 331.

Protection of Loyalists, 36.

Railways

Administration Criticised, 290.

Covenanted Staff's Financial Position, 215.

Goods Rates Increase, 219.

Machinery Orders, Restrictions on, 320.

Policy Regarding Inquiry Committee's Report, 320.

Surcharge on Inland Water Traffic, 56, 66, 69, 88, 107.

War Service of Officials, 42.

Rawlinson, Lord—Council of State Speech Denials, 52.

Rice

Government Control Depreciated, 307.

Rangoon "Corner," 209.

Riots—Particulars of Occurrences in March, 99.

Royal Indian Marine—Organisation into Indian Navy, 109.

17 Feb.—19 Dec., 1921.

Montagu, Rt. Hon. E. S.—cont.**Sedition**

Andrews, Mr., Speeches of, 181.
Anti-British Propaganda Organised,
253.

Arrest of Dr. Kitchlew and Mr.
Rambhuj Dutt, 126.

Conspiracy Convictions and Pardons,
85.

Govind Anand, Swami, Conviction of,
176.

Leaflets Tampering with Loyalty of
Army, 319.

Persecution of Loyal Indian Soldiers,
295.

Prosecutions for, 76, 163.

Sanderson, Rev. W., Alarmist Speeches
by, 226.

Speech at Madras by Mohammed Ali,
123.

Self-Government, Extension of, 300.

Shajungi—Boycott of British Goods
Vowed, 110.

Singapore—Seditious Literature Prosecu-
tions, 152.

Small-Pox

Compulsory Vaccination, 278.

Deaths From in 1918, 279.

Spirits—Imports Statistics, 139.

Stores

Couchman Committees' Report on Pur-
chase, 17.

Regulations as to Purchase, 250, 290.

Students—Facilities for Industrial Study
in United Kingdom, 176.

Sukkur Barrage Scheme

Inquiry Committee Requested, 246, 260.

Opposition to, 249.

Technical Advisers Reporting in Favour
of, 261.

Sutlej River—Hydro Electric Scheme, 90,
142.

Tea—Export Duty's Effect on Industry,
36.

Trade Balances Statistics, 43.

Trade Unions, Legalising of, 63, 125, 318.

Tribal Risings in 1919—Number of Troops
Employed, 164.

Trivandrum College Fees Reduction—
Agitation and Disturbances, 296.

Viceroy, Title of, Burmese Views on, 98.

Vizagapatam Harbour Scheme Progress,
197.

War Expenditure Statistics, 55.

Waziristan

Casualties and Situation in, 150.

Jandola Huts Case, 328.

Makin Bombed after Attack on Ladha
Picquets, 120.

Report on Situation, 281.

Wireless Telegraphy

Development Progress, 25.

Director's Appointment, 97.

Moplah Rebellion

Compulsory Conversion of Hindus to
Mahomedanism, 298, 330.

Position of Affairs, 322, 337.

Repressive Acts—Repeal Alleged not Justi-
fied, 303.

Statement Requested, 292, 296.

Morrison-Bell, Major A. C.

Port of Calcutta Pensions not to be In-
creased, 262.

Motor Cars

Chassis Ordered from Italy, 34, 45.

Samples Provided by British Firms, 35.

Murray, Lieut.-Colonel Hon. A. C.

Mesopotamian Mandate—Annual Cost to
Britain, 7.

Murray, Hon. G.

Emigration—Regulating by Legislation
Deprecated, 243.

Nagpur

Disturbances at, 80.

Naihati

Riots Reported at, 18.

Nall, Lieut.-Colonel J.

Telegraph Cables—Progress of Repair
Work, 247.

National Defence

Annual Cost, 235.

Expenditure on, 269, 284.

Navy, Royal

Indian Contribution to Upkeep, 245.

Newspapers

Editors and Proprietors not Obligated to be
Registered, 212, 222.

Non-Co-operation

Activities of Mr. Gandhi and Ali Brothers,
228.

Arbitration Courts Established, 190.

Bonfire of British Clothing in Bombay,
253, 268.

Boycott of British Cloth, 302.

Free Railway Travel for Crowds Attending
Meetings, 136.

Government Servants Wearing Gandhi
Caps, 328.

Kumaun Forests Destroyed, 215.

Non-Brahmin Federation's Condemnation
of, 19.

Servants of British and of Loyal Indians
Forced to Strike, 219.

North-west Frontier

Raid Statistics, 89.

"Nyanma Taingkyo Thadinsa"

Publication by Government, 86.

Oman, Sir C. W. C.

Civil Service Memorial Complaining of
Increasing Difficulties of Public
Service, 226.

Opium

Export to China Prohibited, 77, 265.

Shipment Statistics Requested, 48.

Supplies to Hong Kong, 48.

Trade Statistics, 339.

Ormsby-Gore, Hon. W.

Aden—Colonial Office to Administer, 44.

Administration — Imperial Parliament's
Right to Interfere, 22, 32.

cont.

17 Feb.—19 Dec., 1921.

Ormsby-Gore, Hon. W.—cont.

- Civil Service—Denning, Dr. A. D., Case, 41.
- Elections—Statistics Requested, 44.
- Government of Burma Bill—Date of Introduction, 37.
- Indian Affairs Committee—Terms of Reference, 68.

Oudh and Rohilkund Railway

- Pay Rates not Increased, 92.

Overseas Settlement

- Officers and Men of Indian Army Ineligible for Grant of Passages, 132.

Palestine

- Cost of Mandate to Britain, 4.

Parker, Mr. J.—Lord Commissioner of the Treasury

- Army
 - Bands—Upkeep Arrangements, 179.
 - Marriage Allowance not to be Given to British Officers, 147.
 - Pensions—Retention beyond Retirement Date owing to War, 132, 230.
 - Reserve of Officers—Civil Servants Refused Concessions, 169.
 - Strength Reduction
 - New Establishment Statistics, 184.
 - Personnel of Committee Deciding Constitution, 184.
- Calcutta—Letter Addressed by Registrar of University to Government, 168.
- Civil Service
 - Discontent Alleged at Lack of Improvements in Pay and Pension, 184.
- Educational Service—Proportion of British and Indian Officials, 158.
- East African 1914 Operations—Compensation for Colonel Aitken, 132.
- Homeward Passages, Cheapening of, 168, 185.
- India Office
 - Belvedere Road Stores Department Pensionable Employés, 158.
 - Legal Department—Painter Case, 307.
- Lahore Fire Brigade Superintendent Ordered to Wear Gandhi's Uniform, 299.
- Legislative Councils—Secretariats' Salaries, 220.
- Madras Strikes—Report on Situation, 230.
- Madras Presidency—Extension of Permanent Settlement System, 238.
- Moplah Rebellion—Compulsory Conversion of Hindus to Mahomedanism, 298.
- Newspapers—Editors and Proprietors not Obligated to be Registered, 212.
- Non-Co-operation—Servants of British and of Loyal Indians Forced to Strike, 219.
- Railways
 - Goods Rates Increase, 61.
 - Stores Orders, Placing of, 169.
- Sedition
 - Agitators, Prosecution of, 211.
 - Leaflets Tampering with Loyalty of Army, 298.

Pearce, Sir W.

- Civil Service Memorial Complaining of Increasing Difficulties of Public Service, 226.

Pennefather, Mr. De F.

- Army—Delay in Payments to Officers Returning to India from Overseas, 110.

Peshawar

- Citizens' Rights Alleged Infringed, 142.

Philipps, General Sir I.

- India Office Staff—Pensions Increase, 233.

Pinkham, Lieut.-Colonel G.

- Army Pay—Date of Increases, 237.

Police

- Medical Costs Incurred—Assistance to Meet, Proposed, 287.

Pay

- Increase Authorised, 238, 244.
- Memorials Presented, 19.
- Overseas Pay—Particulars of Increase, 287.
- Rates, 46, 179.

Political Department

- Pay Rates of Military Officers, 108.

Political Prisoners

- Number Confined in Andamans and in India, 175.
- Treatment of, 337.

Polson, Sir T. A.

- Motor Car Chassis Ordered from Italy, 45.

Prerogative of Mercy

- Person Vested with, 26.

Preservation of Order

- Notice of Motion in House of Commons, 308, 325.
- Outlook for Latter Half of 1921, 197.
- Repressive Methods Denied, 340.
- Situation, 219.

Press Acts

- Action on Report of Committee Examining, 273, 317.
- Repeal Proposed—Views on, 301.

Preston, Sir W. R.

- Finance Sterling Loan, Expenditure on Purchase of British Railway Material, 183.

Printing

- Annual Government Expenditure on, 321.

Prisons

- Amelioration of Conditions Proposed, 185.

Pudukota

- Visit of Mr. Satyamurti Forbidden, 183.

17 Feb.—19 Dec., 1921.

Punjab

- Electoral Rules Criticised, 145.
- Jallianwallah Bagh Shooting, Claims for Losses of Life at, 318.
- Legislative Council
 - Ministers—Har Kishan Lal's Appointment, 14.
 - Publicity Department Grant Refused, 154, 177.
- Nankana
 - Disturbances, 21, 67.
 - Sikhs Murdered by Pathans, 135.
- 1919 Disturbances
 - Persons Imprisoned for Participation in, 134, 144, 331.
 - Protection of Loyalists, 36.
 - Treatment of Officers Concerned in Suppressing, 329.

Questions

- Ministers Failing to Answer, 208.

Railways

- Administration Criticised, 290.
- Covenanted Staff's Financial Position, 215.
- Goods Rates Increase, 61, 218.
- Machinery Orders, Restrictions on, 319.
- Policy Regarding Inquiry Committee's Report, 320.
- Stores Orders, Placing of, 169.
- Surcharge on Inland Water Traffic, 56, 65, 69, 88, 107.
- War Service of Officials, 42.

Randles, Sir J. S.

- Imports—Duty Increases and Imperial Preference, 43.

Raw, Lieut.-Colonel N.

- Army Medical Service's Travelling Facilities, 69.

Rawlinson, Mr. J. F. P.

- Army—Codrington, K. de B., Case, 146.

Rawlinson, Lord

- Council of State Speech Denials, 52.

Rees, Sir J. D.

- Administration
 - Imperial Parliament's Right to Interfere, 31.
- Afghanistan
 - Bolshevik Positions in, 300.
 - Subsidy Payable to Amir, 115.
- Aligarh, Disturbances at, 233.
- Army
 - Esher Committee's Recommendations, 37, 96, 197.
 - Marriage Allowance not Issuable to Officers, 317.
 - Pension, Brevet Rank and, 317.
 - Strength Reduction Proposals, 11.
- Assam Coolies' Exodus
 - Cessation, 251.
 - Position of Affairs, 204.
 - Unrest, 166.
- Behar and Orissa
 - Village Industries Scheme Promoted, 297.
 - Village Self-Government Proposals, 176.

17

Rees, Sir J. D.—cont.

- Bengal
 - Labour Unrest in, 251.
 - Legislative Council—Publicity Department Grant Refused, 268.
 - Police Vote Modification, 141.
- Bokhara, Bolshevik Forces in, 300.
- Bolshevism
 - Gold not Prohibited in India, 115.
 - Rouble Notes Illegal in India, 95.
- British Guiana—Colonisation Scheme, 308.
- British North Borneo Company—Publication of Correspondence Requested, 4.
- Census—Indians Abroad, Counting of, 115.
- Civil Service—Regulations Regarding Relations with Press and Platform, 128.
- Cochin Harbour Scheme Progress, 197.
- Council of State—Discussion on Budget not Permitted, 156, 299.
- Divorce Decrees, Validation of, 61, 70.
- Emigration Bill—Restrictions Placed upon Ceylon, 206.
- Exports Credit Scheme, Exclusion of India from, 214.
- Fiji—Committee Formed to Visit, and Inquire into Colonists' Grievances, 221.
- Finance
 - Fiscal Policy of Government, 277.
 - Statement Requested, 325.
- German Indemnity, India's Claim to a Share of, 135, 253.
- Government of Burma Bill
 - Date of Introduction, 37.
 - Date of Procedure, 258.
- High Court Judges
 - Appointment Regulations, 124.
 - Creation of an Indian Bar Proposed, 124.
- Indian Students' Committee
 - Personnel and Terms of Reference, 195.
 - Report of, 299.
- Lahore—Viceroy's Visit to Consider Gardwaras Shrines Dispute, 155.
- Legislative Councils
 - Publicity Departments, Development of, 294.
 - Standing Committees' Attachment to Provincial Government Departments, 120.
- Madras
 - Legislative Council—Sex Disqualification for Vote Abolished, 137.
 - Non-Brahmin Agitation and Election Results, 123.
 - Strikes—Statement Requested, 234.
- Madras Presidency
 - Extension of Permanent Settlement System, 238.
 - Land Revenue Increase, 264.
- Mesopotamian Mandate—Annual Cost to Britain, 6.
- Monasite Sand—No Foreign-Owned Company Controlling Sale, 244.
- Moplah Rebellion
 - Compulsory Conversion of Hindus to Mahommedanism, 330.
 - Position of Affairs, 337.
 - Repressive Acts—Repeal Alleged not Justified, 304.
 - Statement Requested, 292.
- Non-Co-operation, Non-Brahmin Federation's Condemnation of, 19.

cont.

Rees, Sir J. D.—cont.

- Opium
 - Prohibition of Export to China, 77.
 - Shipment Statistics Requested, 49.
- Police Pay Increase Authorised, 244.
- Press Act, Action on Report of Committee Examining, 273, 317.
- Punjab
 - Jallianwallah Bagh Shooting, Claims for Losses of Life at, 318.
 - Nankana Disturbances, 67.
 - 1919 Disturbances, Persons Imprisoned for Participation in, 331.
- Sedition
 - Anti-British Propaganda Organised, 252.
 - Govind Anand, Swami, Conviction of, 176.
 - Sanderson, Rev. W., Alarmist Speeches by, 225.
- Tea—Export Duty's Effect on Industry, 36.
- Trivandrum—College Fees Reduction Agitation and Disturbances, 296.
- Vizagapatam Harbour Scheme Progress, 197.

Remer, Mr. J. R.

- Non-Co-operation — Boycott of British Cloth, 302.

Rendall, Mr. A.

- Army Pensions
 - Wife an Innocent Party in Divorce Suit, Position of, 171.
- Withheld for Grave Misconduct—Hennessy Case, 172.
- Divorce Decrees, Validation of, 131.
- Railways—War Service of Officials, 42.

Rice

- "Corner," Alleged Formation of, 208.
- Government Control Deprecated, 307.
- Rangoon "Corner," 209.

Richardson, Mr. R.

- Civil Service—Contracts between Officials and Government, 102.
- Prisons—Amelioration of Conditions Proposed, 185.

Riots

- Particulars of Occurrences in March, 99.

Roberts, Mr. S.

- Sterling Loan—Expenditure on Purchase of British Railway Material, 178.

Robinson, Mr. S.

- Excise Revenue Statistics, 138.
- Spirits—Import Statistics, 139.

Royal Indian Marine

- Organisation into Indian Navy, 109.

Russia

- Representation at London Conference, 8.

Samuel, Mr. A. M.

- Trade Balances Statistics, 43.

Sanders, Colonel Sir R. A.—Under-

- Secretary of State for War
- Punjab—Nankana Riots, 21.

Secretary of State

- Powers of, 27.

Sedition

- Agitators, Prosecution of, 211.
- Andrews, Mr., Speeches of, 181.
- Anti-British Propaganda Organised, 252.
- Arrest of Dr. Kitchlew and Mr. Rhambhuj Dutt, 88, 126.
- Conspiracy Convictions and Pardons, 85.
- Govind Anand, Swami, Conviction of, 176.
- Leaflets Tampering with Loyalty of Army, 298, 319.
- Persecution of Loyal Indian Soldiers, 295.
- Prosecutions for, 75, 163.
- Sanderson, Rev. W., Alarmist Speeches by, 225.
- Speeches by Mohammed Ali, 122, 136.
- Speeches Delivered by Ali Brothers—Apology and Undertaking Made, 216.

Self-Government

- Extension of, 300.

Sèvres Treaty

- Modification of, 62.

Shajungi

- Boycott of British Goods Vowed, 110.

Shankat Ali

- See Ali Brothers.

Shaw, Hon. A.

- Assam Coolies' Exodus—Position of Affairs, 203.
- Bengal Disturbances, 203.
- Emigration Bill—Restrictions Placed upon Ceylon, 206.
- Railways—Surcharge on Inland Water Traffic, 56, 69, 88, 107.

Short, Mr. A.

- "Nyanma Taingkyo Thadinsa"—Publication by Government, 86.

Singapore

- Seditious Literature Prosecutions, 152.

Sitch, Mr. C. H.

- Hong Kong Child Adoption—Legislation Requested, 8.

Small-pox

- Compulsory Vaccination, 278.
- Deaths from, in 1918, 279.
- Madras Outbreaks 261.

Speaker, Rulings of

- Administration Imperial Parliament's Right to Interfere, 23, 29.
- Indian Emergency Committee, Views of Indian Legislature on, 77.
- Punjab Legislative Council Ministers—Har Kishan Lal's Appointment, 16.
- Questions, Ministers Failing to Answer, 208.

Spirits

- Imports Statistics, 139.

Spoor, Mr. B. C.

- Burma—Shwe Dagon Pagoda Evacuated, 19.

17 Feb.—19 Dec., 1921.

Spoor, Mr. B. C.—cont.

- Civil Service—Contracts between Officials and Government, 101.
- Gaols Committee—Minutes of Evidence not to be Published, 177.
- “Independent” Newspaper—Imprisonment of Publisher, 249.
- India Office—Salaries Exceeding £1,000 per annum, 189.
- Political Prisoners—Number Confined in Andamans and in India, 175.
- Preservation of Order—Repressive Methods Denied, 340.

**Stanley, Lieut.-Colonel Hon. G. F.—
*Financial Secretary to the War Office***

- Income Tax—Army Officers Serving in Mesopotamia, 185.

Stewart, Mr. G.

- Civil Service—District Officers' Financial Difficulties, 207.
- Opium—Shipment Statistics Requested, 48.
- Telegraph Cables—Progress of Repair Work, 247.

Stores

- Couchman Committee's Report on Purchase, 17.
- Regulations as to Purchase, 250, 290.

Students

- Facilities for Industrial Study in United Kingdom, 176.

Sugden, Mr. W. H.

- Cotton Import Duties Increase, 262.
- Exchange Rates—Stabilisation of Rupee, 20.

Sukkur Barrage Scheme

- Inquiry Committee Requested, 246, 260.
- Opposition to, 249.
- Technical Advisers Reporting in Favour of, 261.

Sutlej River

- Hydro-Electric Scheme, 90, 142.

Swan, Mr. J. E.

- Burma—Repression Policy Alleged, 114.

Tea

- Export Duty's Effect on Industry, 36.

Telegraph Cables

- Progress of Repair Work, 247.

Terrell, Mr. G.

- Government of Burma Bill—Date of Procedure, 259.

Terrell, Captain R.

- London Conference, Cost of, 8.

Thomson, Mr. T.

- Egret Feathers—Export Prohibited, 120.
- India Office—Annual Leave Arrangements, 243.

Thorne, Mr. W.

- Cotton Mills—Dividend Paid, 224.

Townshend, Sir C. V. F.

- Army Reconstruction—Committee Considering, 167.

Trade

- Balances Statistics, 43.

Trade Unions

- Legalising of, 63, 125, 318.

Trivandrum

- College Fees Reduction—Agitation and Disturbances, 296.

Tudor-Rees, Captain J.

- Public Works Department
- Pay Increase Memorial, 87.
- Secretary's Salary, 87.

United States of America

- Silver Dollars Purchase and Annual Rupee Credit, 130.

Viceroy

- Title of, Burmese Views on, 98.

Vizagapatam

- Harbour Scheme Progress, 197.

Waddington, Mr. R.

- Cotton
- Mills—Dividends Paid, 222.
- Revenue Derived from Duty on, 67.
- Fiscal Commission
- Consideration of Trade Interests Involved, 289.
- List of Questions Issued by, 332.
- Policy Required by India, 66.
- Terms of Reference, 289.

War

- Expenditure Statistics, 55.

Waterson, Mr. A. E.

- Madras—Small-Pox Epidemics, 261.
- “Nyanma Taingkyo Thadinsa”—Publication by Government, 86.

Waziristan

- Bolshevik Propaganda in, 121, 126.
- Casualties, and Situation in, 150.
- Jandola Huts Case, 327.
- Makin Bombed after Attack on Ladha Picquets, 120.
- Situation in, 140, 228, 281.

Wedgwood, Colonel J. C.

- Allahabad—Acquisition of Bungalow in New Cantonment, 235.
- Andamans—Prison System Report Publication, 89.
- Army
- Auditing of Accounts, 163.
- Strength Reduction Proposals, 97.
- Assam Coolies' Exodus—Position of Affairs, 204, 205.
- Bengal Legislative Council—Publicity Department Grant Refused, 268.
- Bombay Legislative Council—Sex-Disqualification for Franchise Removed, 253.
- Burma
- Boycotting of Loyalists—Extremists Imprisoned, 340.
- College Strike, 63.

cont.

17 Feb.—19 Dec., 1921.

Wedgwood, Colonel J. C.—cont.Burma—*cont.*

Constitutional Reform—Popular Opposition Alleged, 161.

Shikho Custom Continuance, 98.

Shwe Dagon Pagoda

Evacuation by Military, 64.

Restoration to Trustees, 161.

Cattle Slaughter—Cessation Requested, 141.

Coal Export without Licence Prohibited, 273.

Cost of Living Statistics Requested, 53.

Established Church—Upkeep Charge on Indian Revenue, 119.

Finance

Pensions Payable to Men Concerned in Punjab Disturbances, 156.

Reverse Drafts, Loss by Sale of, 255.

Fiscal Commission—Personnel Particulars Requested, 54.

Gaols Report, Publication of, 156.

Gujranwala, Station Removed from, 88, 135.

International Labour Conference, Indian Delegates to, 93.

Japan—National Defence, Expenditure on, 269.

Johnson, Colonel F., Oil Concession Alleged Granted to, 114.

Kumaun—Forests Destroyed by Non-Cooperators, 215.

Legislative Councils

Salaries of Ministers in Charge of Transferred Subjects, 285.

Veto Exercised by Lieutenant-Governors, 242.

Lyallpur—Imprisonment of Dr. Kitchlew and Mr. Rhambhaj Dutt, 88, 126.

Madras

Buckingham Carnatic Mills Lock-Out, 248.

Legislative Council—Sex Disqualification for Franchise Removed, 175, 253.

Non-Brahmin Agitation and Election Results, 124.

Strike

Progress of, 242.

Report on Situation, 230.

Statement Requested, 235.

National Defence, Expenditure on, 269.

Navy, Royal—Indian Contribution to Upkeep, 246.

North-West Frontier—Raid Statistics, 89.

Peshawar—Citizens' Rights Alleged Infringed, 142.

Prisons—Treatment of Political Prisoners, 337.

Pudukota—Visit of Mr. Satyamurti Forbidden, 183.

Punjab

Electoral Rules Criticised, 145.

Nankana—Sikhs Murdered by Pathans, 135.

1919 Disturbances, Number of Persons in Prison Since, 134, 144.

Riots—Particulars of Occurrences in March, 100.

Sedition—Arrest of Dr. Kitchlew and Mr. Rhambhaj Dutt, 88, 126.

Sèvres Treaty, Modification of, 62.

Trade Unions, Legalising of, 63, 125, 319.

Viceroy—Burmese Views on Title of, 98.

War Expenditure Statistics, 55.

Wills, Lieut.-Colonel Sir G.

Police

Medical Costs Incurred — Proposed Assistance to Meet, 287.

Overseas Pay, Particulars of Increase, 287.

Wireless Telegraphy

Development Progress, 25.

Director's Appointment, 97.

Wood, Hon. E. F. L.

Mesopotamia—M'Arthur, D., Case, 154.

Wood, Major M. M.

Moplah Rebellion—Statement Requested, 296.

Yate, Colonel Sir C. E.

Afghanistan

Negotiations in Progress at Kabul, 97.

Tribal Risings in 1919—Number of Troops Employed, 164.

Ali Brothers, Birthplace of, 321.

Allahabad—University Examiners' Adverse Report on Quality of Work, 121.

Army

Badges and Shoulder Titles Alterations, 151.

Bands Upkeep Arrangements, 45, 178.

Cadets

Entering from Sandhurst, 87.

1916 Candidates, Future of, 157.

Selection for Indian Army Voluntary, 189.

Cavalry—Allotment of Duties for Internal Security, 276.

Chargers, Purchase at Concessional Rates, 89.

Comparative Strengths of Cavalry in European Countries, 157.

Differentiation between Married and Single Officers, 245.

Disbandment

Cavalry Reductions, 11, 138, 159.

List of Units Concerned, 111.

Particulars of, 101.

Pre-War Infantry Battalions, 148, 224, 280.

Proceeding in Spite of Undertaking to the Contrary, 118, 236, 256.

Surplus British Cavalry Officers, Future of, 284, 294, 330.

Suspended Operations, 126.

Esher Report Recommendations, 13.

Field Service Batta for Afghanistan and Waziristan Operations, 291.

Housing of Officers, 32.

King's India Cadets to Enter Indian Army, 32.

Language Examinations, Alleged Increased Difficulty of, 278.

Machine Gun Corps Incorporated in Cavalry and Infantry Units, 113.

Marriage Allowance not to be given to British Officers, 147.

Mess Dress, Wearing of, 242.

Military Accounts Department to be Re-organised, 44.

Pay

Concession to Officers Studying in Japan, 277.

Increases, 50.

Royal Engineers Officers' Rates, 177.

17 Feb.—19 Dec., 1921.

Yate, Colonel Sir C. E.—cont.**Army—cont.****Pensions**

Re-assessment of Officers who have held High Civil Appointments, 9, 111, 171, 221, 244, 285.

Retention beyond Retiring Age owing to War, 132, 164, 230, 302.

Re-organisation Proposals, 84.

Reserve of Officers—Civil Servants Refused Commissions, 168.

Strength Reduction

Allotment of Cavalry to Provinces, 256.

Basis of, 182.

Inquiries by Imperial Defence Committee, 241.

New Establishment Statistics, 183.

Number of Units not under Disbandment Orders, 269.

Personnel of Committee Deciding Constitution, 184.

Position Regarding Continued Tribal Risings, 173.

Proposals, 11, 96.

Return Requested, 266.

White Paper Publication Requested, 276.

Travelling Concessions to Officers, 45, 64.

Assam Coolies' Exodus—Position of Affairs, 199, 205.

Auxiliary Force Act

Compulsory Methods of Recruitment, 172.

Recruiting Statistics, 13, 148, 159, 309.

Basante Kumar Roy, Sinn Fein Emissary to India, 309.

Bengal**Police**

Abolition Proposed, 286.

Alleged Inadequate to Cope with Dacoities, 186.

Grant Reduced, 79.

No British Officers to be Appointed to, 295.

Publicity Department Grant not Sanctioned, 177.

Bhagalpur—Criticism of Prosecution Administration (Grant Case), 310.

Bolshevism

Activities in India, 76.

Frontier Disturbances Alleged Financed by Soviet Funds, 127.

British Army—Pay, Effect of Exchange Rate on, 192.

Calcutta—Letter Addressed by Registrar of University to Government, 168.

Central Provinces

Abolition of Commissioners of Divisions, 326.

Legislative Council—Increased Pay of Provincial Service Officers not Sanctioned, 330.

Cinematograph Films—Censorship Established, 327.

Civil Service

Bonus Sliding Scale, 90.

Candidates—Proportion of Europeans at Examinations, 291.

Educational Service—Proportion of British and Indian Officials, 158.

Yate, Colonel Sir C. E.—cont.**Civil Service—cont.**

Memorial Complaining of Increasing Difficulties of Public Service, 227.

Pensions—Proportionate, Conditions of Issue, 149, 194, 213, 228, 280.

Demobilisation Delays

Bombay, 117, 131.

Deolali, 131, 163, 180.

Elections—Statistics Requested, 121, 258.

Exchange Rates

Compensation for Army Officers, 91.

Japan, Position of Officers Studying in, 185.

Finance—Revenue Statistics Requested, 203.

Gandhi, Mr., Birthplace of, 321.

Government of Burma Bill—Date of Procedure, 259.

Gwalior, Newspapers Forbidden in, 193, 285.

Homeward Passages—Cheapening of Cost, 33, 68, 168, 185, 265, 307.

Imperial Conference—Decisions as to Indian Co-operation in Empire Defence, 270.

Income Tax—Army Officers Serving in Mesopotamia, 185.

Indian Affairs Committee, Appointment of, 58.

Indian Arms Act—British Residents' Alleged Dissatisfaction, 25.

Japan—National Defence, Expenditure on, 269, 284.

Kuki Hills—Medal for Operations in, Proposed, 164.

Kumaun—Forests Destroyed by Non-Cooperators, 215.

Lahore—Fire Brigade Superintendent Ordered to Wear Gandhi Uniform, 298, 328.

Legislative Assembly—Franchise for Retired Indian Officers of Indian Army, 213, 221.

Legislative Councils

Deposit Required from Candidates Proposed, 34.

Publicity Offices Alleged not Encouraged, 191.

Madras

Non-Brahmin Agitation and Election Results, 124.

Seditious Speeches by Mohammed Ali, 136.

Madras Military Fund

Increases in Pensions Requested, 128.

Particulars of Assets and Interest, 179.

Moplah Rebellion

Compulsory Conversion of Hindus to Mahomedanism, 298.

Position of Affairs, 338.

Repressive Acts—Repeal Alleged not Justified, 303.

Statement Requested, 293.

Nagpur, Disturbances at, 80.

National Defence, Expenditure on, 235, 269, 284.

Navy, Royal—Indian Contribution to Upkeep, 245.

Newspapers—Editors and Proprietors not Compelled to be Registered, 212, 222.

N cont.

Yate, Colonel Sir C. E.—*cont.*

Non-Co-operation
 Arbitration Courts Established, 190.
 Free Railway Travel for Crowds Attending Meetings, 136.
 Government Servants Wearing Gandhi Caps, 328.
 Servants of British and of Loyal Indians Forced to Strike, 219.
 Opium Export to China Prohibited, 265.
 Overseas Settlement—Officers and Men of Indian Army Ineligible for Grant of Passages, 133.
 Police Pay Rates, 46, 179, 238.
 Political Department—Pay Rates of Military Officers, 108.
 Press Acts Repeal Proposed—Views on, 301.
 Punjab
 Legislative Council—Publicity Department Grant Refused, 154, 177.
 Nankana Riots, 21.
 1919 Disturbances
 Protection of Loyalists, 36.
 Treatment of Officers Concerned in Suppressing, 329.
 Riots—Particulars of Occurrences in March, 99.
 Royal Indian Marine—Organisation into Indian Navy, 109.
 Sedition
 Agitators, Prosecution of, 211.

22

Yate, Colonel Sir C. E.—*cont.*

Sedition—*cont.*
 Arrest of Dr. Kitchlew and Mr. Rhambluj Dutt, 126.
 Conspiracy Convictions and Pardons, 85.
 Leaflets Tampering with Loyalty of Army, 298, 319.
 Persecution of Loyal Indian Soldiers, 295.
 Prosecution Statistics Requested, 75, 163.
 Speech at Madras by Mohammed Ali, 122.
 Sukkur Barrage Scheme
 Inquiry Committee Proposed, 246.
 Technical Advisers Reporting in Favour of, 261.
 Trade Unions, Legalising of, 63, 318.
 Wireless Telegraphy
 Development Progress, 25.
 Director's Appointment, 97.
 Waziristan, Situation in, 140.

Young, Mr. E. H.—*Financial Secretary to the Treasury*

International Labour Conference, Indian Delegates to, 93.
 United States of America—Silver Dollars Purchase and Annual Rupee Credit, 130.

Young, Mr. R.

Microscopes, American Contract for, 165.
 Railway—Covenanted Staff's Financial Position, 215.

